00067920

NOT TO BE ISSUED OUT
WITHOUT PERMISSION.

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 05 October, 2018

THE STUDY
OF
THE NEW TESTAMENT.

LONDON : PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

AN INTRODUCTION

TO THE

STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

CRITICAL, EXEGETICAL, AND THEOLOGICAL

BY

SAMUEL DAVIDSON, D.D.

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HALLE AND LL.D.

SECOND EDITION, REVISED AND IMPROVED.

67920

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

LONDON:
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
1882.

All rights reserved.

225
Bib/Int
6,120

00067920

CONTENTS

OF

THE SECOND VOLUME.

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY

PAGE

Notices of Timothy in the New Testament—Time and place at which the Epistle was written—Contents—Agreement of contents with the writer's purpose—Authenticity 1

THE EPISTLE TO TITUS

Notices of Titus in the New Testament—Introduction of the Gospel into Crete—Time and place of writing—Contents—Object—Adaptation of contents to the object—Authenticity 8

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY

Time of writing—Object—Contents—Authenticity . . 14
Authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles 21

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

Contents—The title—Credibility—Sources—Authorship—Leading object—Date and place—Chronology—State of the text 74

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS

Colossæ and its church—Authenticity, theology, and date—Contents—The Epistle from Laodicea . . . 170

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS

PAGE

Ephesus and its first connection with the Christian religion —The persons to whom the letter was addressed— Authenticity—Time, place, and occasion of writing— Contents 195

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN

Authenticity — Time and place of writing — Persons addressed—The form—Occasion and object—Integrity— Contents 231

THE SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF JOHN

Authorship—To whom addressed—Occasion and object— Time and place—Contents 254

THE EPISTLE OF JUDE

Authorship—Authenticity—Time and place of writing—. Persons addressed; occasion and object—Contents . 264

THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

Alleged author—Analysis of contents—Leading characteristics—Comparison with the synoptical gospels—Authorship and date, including external and internal evidence —Immediate occasion and object—Integrity—Style and diction—Quotations 275

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER

Relation to Jude's Epistle—Authenticity—Original readers —Errorists of the Epistle—Object and time—Integrity —Contents—Doctrinal ideas of Peter's Epistles . . 438

INDEX 475

Errata.

Vol. I., page 9, line 21, *for* 'Atoninus' *read* 'Antoninus.'
„ „ 170, „ 19, *for* 'Schulz' *read* 'Schinz.'
„ „ 302, „ 14, *for* 'to' *read* 'at.'
„ „ 309, „ 11, *for* 'Widmansted' *read* 'Widmanstad.'
„ „ 572, last line but one, *dele* 'Cyril of Alexandria.'

INTRODUCTION

TO

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

NOTICES OF TIMOTHY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE NEW TESTAMENT furnishes several notices of Timothy's public life. He was a native of Derbe in Lycaonia, his father being a Greek and his mother a Jewess. The latter instructed him early in the Old Testament Scriptures. The names of her and of his grandmother are both mentioned. When Paul came from Antioch in Syria the second time to Lystra, he found this youthful disciple; and as the Christians at Lystra and Derbe spoke well of him, recommending him to the confidence of the Gentile missionary, the latter took him for his assistant. It is not certain if he was converted by the apostle at his first visit to Lystra and Derbe, though it is probable from expressions applied to him (1 Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 2; 1 Cor. iv. 17). We refer his conversion to the time specified in Acts xiv. 6, when Paul and Barnabas visited Derbe and Lystra.

After he became companion to the apostle (Acts xvi. 3), he rendered important service in the cause of the gospel, and was greatly beloved for his fidelity, affection,

and zeal. The intimacy subsisting between them was of the best kind—the master regarding the disciple with affectionate solicitude; the disciple looking up to the spiritual father with all respect. After being circumcised, and set apart to the work of an evangelist by the elders of the church at Lystra who laid their hands on him along with the apostle, he travelled with the latter to Macedonia by Troas. Being left at Berœa, he joined Paul again at Athens, and was sent thence to Thessalonica. From Thessalonica he went to Corinth, and assisted the apostle there (Acts xviii. 5; 1 Thess. iii. 6). Subsequently he was again at Ephesus (Acts xix. 22), whence he was despatched into Macedonia and Achaia before the apostle took his second journey from Ephesus into those regions (Acts xix. 22; 1 Cor. iv. 17; xvi. 10). When the second epistle to the Corinthians was written, he was with Paul in Macedonia. At a later period, when the epistle to the Romans was composed at Corinth, Timothy was with the writer. On Paul's return through Macedonia, Timothy went before him to Troas (Acts xx. 5). Whether he accompanied him to Jerusalem and Rome, or followed him thither, is uncertain; but he is mentioned in the epistles written at Rome (Phil. i. 1; Philem. 1). According to Hebrews xiii. 23, he seems to have been a prisoner in Rome, and was soon released. Ecclesiastical tradition makes him first bishop of Ephesus, where he is said to have suffered martyrdom under Domitian or Nerva.

TIME AND PLACE AT WHICH THE EPISTLE WAS WRITTEN.

The writer indicates that he was a prisoner at Rome. And some circumstances favour the idea that he was in the state of captivity described in Acts xxviii. 17, etc., during which he wrote to the Philippians and Philemon; for he was fastened to a soldier by a chain (Acts xxviii. 20), and refers to it in the second letter to Timothy

(i. 16). At Rome he dwelt in a hired lodging, and received all that came to him, which agrees with 2 Tim. iv. 21, where salutations are sent from various persons. There was thus free access to him when he wrote. Luke too was with him, who is mentioned in the letter to Philemon. The exhortation to shun youthful lusts was also more suitable then than afterwards. Had twelve or fifteen years elapsed since Timothy's conversion, he could scarcely have been addressed after this fashion. But the similarity of situation belonging to the author, which is seen in the acknowledged epistles of the Roman captivity and the second to Timothy, is marred by dissimilarity. In the epistles to Philemon and the Philippians, he expresses a hope of speedy release, and even desires Philemon to prepare a lodging (Phil. ii. 24; Philem. 22). Yet when he wrote this epistle, he was treated as a malefactor (ii. 9), and his prospects were gloomy. He expected daily to fall a victim to the vengeance of enemies (iv. 6–8). All his friends were scattered, and only Luke was with him. There is also no account in the Acts of his public appearance or defence before the emperor, though it had taken place shortly before the writing of the present letter. Above all, Timothy and Mark were absent (2 Tim. iv. 9, 11); though they were present when the epistles to Philemon and Philippians were composed. We may indeed conjecture that they followed the apostle to Rome, left him to go on different missions, and were still absent when the second to Timothy was written; but the conjecture is improbable. We shall show afterwards, that there are insuperable difficulties in the way of believing that the letter was composed at any period of the first captivity at Rome, which is tantamount to saying that it was not written by Paul, his second imprisonment being an imaginary one.

CONTENTS.

The epistle scarcely admits of formal division, but the following seems the most pertinent: an introduction, i. 1–5; various exhortations and encouragements, i. 6–iv. 8; a request to come to Rome as soon as possible, accompanied by various particulars in the way of information, by commissions, and salutations for the brethren in Asia Minor, iv. 9–22.

1. The introduction contains an assertion of the writer's apostleship, which was instituted for announcing the promise of eternal life. He expresses his affectionate concern for Timothy, assuring him that he prayed continually for his welfare, remembered his tears at parting, and longed greatly to see him (i. 1–5).

2. He exhorts the evangelist to be diligent and active in the exercise of the gifts he received at ordination, since God had not given Christians fear of difficulty or danger, but the spirit of power, love, and a sound mind. Hence he is not to be ashamed of sufferings, nor of association with Paul a prisoner, but to be partaker of afflictions by virtue of the power of God, who calls and saves all Christians according to His eternal purpose, accomplished in the appearance of Jesus Christ, who took away the power of death, and had appointed him to publish these glad tidings. Hence the writer suffers willingly, persuaded that he shall not lose his reward. He exhorts Timothy to retain the form of sound doctrine, and to keep the sacred trust inviolable (i. 6–14).

He reminds the evangelist that all the Christians of Asia Minor had left him; but mentions the steady attachment of Onesiphorus who had lately visited him, for which the grateful writer prays that God would abundantly reward him (i. 15–18).

He presses Timothy earnestly to steadfastness, and to teach the doctrine he had received to men who should

faithfully commit it to others ; to act and suffer like one who had devoted himself wholly to the work of an evangelist, for he must first labour and suffer, before expecting a reward. He refers him to the resurrection of Jesus Christ, his own example, and the Christian hope, according to which they that are dead with Christ shall live with him, and they that suffer shall reign with him. Timothy is to remind the teachers of Christianity of the folly of striving about words and names ; while he must watch his own teachings, and shun empty fables destructive of the spirit of piety, as appeared in the case of Hymeneus and Philetus who asserted that the resurrection was past. But genuine Christians stand fast, their discipleship being known by a divine test. In the Church there are true believers, as well as teachers of error ; and till a man purge himself from communion with false teachers and their follies, he is not fit for the Master's use. To keep himself free, Timothy is exhorted to avoid youthful lusts, to follow righteousness, faith, charity, and peace ; to shun foolish and unlearned questions. He must not dispute with, but oppose heretics with patience and lenity, that he may reclaim some if possible (ii. 1–26).

The evangelist is informed that perilous times should come, marked by the appearance of men of the vilest character, pretending to virtue, but having none. Such were those who crept into houses and led away the weak whom they pretended to instruct. These men resisted the truth, as the magicians of Egypt withstood Moses (iii. 1–9). In contrast with them, he commends Timothy for following his doctrine, and copying the fidelity, charity, and patience he had observed in him, and had seen plain evidences of in the sufferings undergone ; a treatment all must expect who will be faithful in persecution. But impostors grow more degenerate to avoid suffering. He recommends to his disciple the study of the Old Testament, with which he had been

early acquainted, adding to it faith in Christ Jesus (10–17). Having such helps, he is solemnly charged, by the prospect of the final judgment, to use the greatest diligence in promoting the truth, and in opposing present, as well as preventing future, corruptions. The time approached when Christians would not endure sound doctrine, but listen to every one offering instruction, however false his pretensions. There was therefore need for him to be vigorous like a faithful evangelist, especially considering that his father in the gospel was so near death. And as the mention of this fact seemed likely to discourage Timothy, the apostle speaks of the faith and hope that formed his present solace (iv. 1–8).

3. The writer requests Timothy to hasten to Rome, because all his attendants had forsaken him except Luke, and to call at Troas on his way, bringing with him some books which had been left there. He is warned against Alexander, who had been Paul's enemy. All friends had forsaken the writer at his first public defence. But he was divinely delivered from imminent peril, that he might finish his work ; and doubts not that he shall be preserved from every deed he might be led to commit through want of steadfastness, and be conducted into the heavenly kingdom (9–18).

He salutes some of the Christians, and informs Timothy of the circumstances of others. After mentioning the greetings of several believers at Rome, he concludes with a benediction (19–22).

AGREEMENT OF CONTENTS WITH THE WRITER'S PURPOSE.

The object of the letter was to bring Timothy to Rome, as stated in iv. 9. Along with this are various instructions and admonitions, some of which at least are unsuitable. The evangelist is supposed to be so inexperienced as to require a warning against youthful lusts, and so ignorant as to be told the use of Holy Scripture.

He is reminded, by way of encouragement, of his pious education, and is treated as a tyro, being told that Paul was appointed a teacher of the Gentiles. The allusion in iii. 11 to Acts xiii. 50 ; xiv. 2, 7, 19, is inappropriate, because, as Eichhorn observes, the apostle would not have mentioned only the persecutions of which Timothy had not been an eyewitness, but the far more cruel ones to which he was subjected at Philippi, at Thessalonica, and at Jerusalem. There is also some inconsistency between iii. 1, etc. 13, and iii. 9, for it is declared in the former, that evil men and seducers should become worse and worse ; whereas in iii. 9, 'they shall proceed no farther.' We do not speak of the disjointed character of the epistle ; for this may be explained consistently with Pauline authorship ; but there is enough besides to excite the strongest suspicions. Was it needful to tell Timothy to 'continue in the things he had learned ;' to 'do the work of an evangelist,' 'to be apt to teach ?' Is not poverty of thought and diction shown in the repetition, 'The Lord give mercy unto the house of Onesiphorus' (i. 16), and 'The Lord grant unto him, that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day' (i. 18)? Most of the exhortations are commonplace. We believe, therefore, that the contents are unsuitable to the persons and circumstances. Had Paul been writing a last letter to Timothy, requesting him to come quickly to Rome, he would not have interspersed so many obvious admonitions, but have dwelt in preference upon one or two great principles. And why send for him at all, when it was very uncertain if he should live to see him ? Ready to be offered up, the apostle did not need the comfort of another's presence.

AUTHENTICITY.

This will be considered along with that of the two other epistles.

THE EPISTLE TO TITUS.

NOTICES OF TITUS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

TITUS is not named in the Acts, though he was Paul's companion and fellow-labourer. A few fragmentary notices of him occur in the Pauline epistles. He was of Gentile origin, both his parents being Greeks ; and Paul would not allow him to be circumcised, though the Judaisers wished it. Probably he was a native of Antioch in Syria.

It is generally believed that he was converted through the apostle's instrumentality, because he is addressed as Paul's *own son* after the common faith (i. 4). That event took place before the council at Jerusalem, which was fourteen years after Paul's conversion.

When first noticed in the New Testament, he was with the apostle at Antioch, and accompanied him to Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 1, 2, 3). Perhaps he returned to Antioch with the other brethren. What motive led him subsequently to Ephesus does not appear. He was sent from Ephesus to Corinth (2 Cor. vii., viii., xii.) to observe the state of the church there, particularly the effect of Paul's letter to the Corinthians. After the apostle left Ephesus, Titus was expected at Troas. Having met Paul in Macedonia, he was despatched with the second epistle to the Corinthians (2 Cor. viii. 6, 16, 17, 23). He appears next at Rome ; from which city he went to Dalmatia, according to the second epistle to Timothy.

It is difficult to fix his Cretan visit. Tradition makes him the first bishop of Crete, where he is said to have died at an advanced age.

INTRODUCTION OF THE GOSPEL INTO CRETE.

Philo intimates that there were many Jews in Crete. Some of them appear to have embraced Christianity as early as the day of Pentecost; and these returning home may have made their countrymen acquainted with the truth. Paul visited Crete on his voyage to Rome; but the author of the Acts says nothing about the planting of Christianity in the place. The epistle supposes that Paul and Titus were together in Crete, and that the apostle's labours there were most successful; but the time is not told. We are completely in the dark as to the introduction of Christianity into the island.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

The time and place of composition must be fixed by conjecture. Paul's supposed voyage to Crete has to be inserted in the interval between his leaving Ephesus and his passing through Macedonia the second time (Acts xx. 1–3). The writing of the letter has to be put in the same period; but the place is uncertain. We shall show hereafter, that the epistle was not written during the eighteen months' stay at Corinth mentioned in Acts xviii. 1–18; nor in Ephesus, either at the time of Acts xviii. 19, or the three years' abode there (Acts xix. 1–41); nor in Greece (Acts xx. 2), nor at Troas or Nicopolis (Acts xx. 2, 3, 6). If the apostle was released from imprisonment at Rome he may have written it then; but that release is historically worthless. The composition of the letter must be dated after the apostle's death.

CONTENTS.

The epistle may be divided into three parts: the introduction, i. 1–4; the body, containing a variety of instructions, i. 5–iii. 11; and the conclusion, iii. 12–15. The second may be subdivided into various paragraphs: i. 5–9; 10–16; ii. 1–iii. 7; 8–11.

1. The inscription and salutation are contained in the first four verses.

2. The writer reminds Titus of the reason why he was left in Crete, viz. to set the Church in order and appoint elders in every city. He proceeds to describe the character of a bishop in words closely resembling the directions given to Timothy on the same subject. Among other qualifications, he must maintain the established truths of the gospel, and have ability to convince or silence opposers; for there are many disorderly persons and deceivers, especially Judaisers, who overturn whole families, teaching improper things through covetousness. The Cretans had a bad reputation. One of their poets had described them as notoriously addicted to lying, luxury, and infamous lusts. The apostle enjoins Titus to use due severity in reproving them; and particularly to keep them from the doctrine of the Judaising Gnostics. All kinds of meat and drink, he says, are pure to the pure in heart; but the heart and conscience of the unbelieving are defiled. They have a theoretical knowledge of God, and yet lead wicked lives (i. 5–16).

Titus is exhorted to teach things agreeable to sound doctrine; that elder persons of both sexes should act in a manner becoming the dignity of age and the obligations of Christians; and that the young should behave well, lest the word of God be dishonoured. He is to advise young men in particular to be sober-minded, at the same time showing a pattern of good works in his

own person ; setting forth pure doctrine ; using sound speech that the adversary might be confounded, having no ground of accusation against him. He is to exhort slaves to be obedient to their masters with patience, meekness, and fidelity, that they may recommend the Christian religion ; for the grace of God, says the writer, has appeared to all men, freemen and slaves, Jews and Gentiles, teaching them to practise universal holiness while they wait for the blessed appearing of Jesus Christ the Saviour, who offered himself a ransom for all, to make them zealous of good works.

The evangelist is to remind Christians to be submissive to civil rulers ; to speak evil of none, especially of magistrates, but to be gentle and meek. To enforce this, the author intimates that such as were then believers, were formerly foolish, disobedient, and wicked ; and when the love of God the Saviour appeared, they were not saved by righteous deeds, but by His own mercy and the renewing of the Holy Spirit, whose influences were abundantly shed upon them that they might become heirs of the hope of eternal life.

The doctrine thus asserted is infallibly true, and Titus is bound to affirm it constantly in order that believers may carefully maintain good works. But he must avoid foolish questions, genealogies, and disputed points about the law, because of their unprofitableness. He that asserts corrupt doctrine is to be rejected, because he is perverse and self-condemned.

3. A few personal notices form the conclusion. Among other particulars, Titus is ordered to make suitable provision for Zenas and Apollos on their journey, and to press the Cretans to be generous on all such occasions. After salutations from himself and those with him, the writer concludes with a benediction (iii. 8–11).

OBJECT.

The epistle originated in the wish that Titus should come to the apostle before winter, after he had organised the church and combated false teachers.

ADAPTATION OF CONTENTS TO THE OBJECT.

There is some incongruity between the contents and the author's supposed situation.

The way in which the Cretan converts are spoken of is not Pauline. Instead of alluding to them in terms of commendation for their ready acceptance of the gospel, they are harshly characterised on the testimony of another. It is true that the apostle did not write in this manner to themselves but to Titus ; yet that does not alter the spirit evinced. And how did the apostle know the false teachers against whom he warns Titus ? He himself was but a short time in the island. False teachers could hardly have appeared during his stay. Christianity had made some progress before the errorists showed activity ; so that Paul had left the island. Titus, who remained behind, knew what they were much better than one who had not seen them. The apostle speaks about what he did not know to one that did know. The instructions respecting church officers also imply the existence of Christianity in the island for a considerable period. A bishop should have Christian children. His qualifications for the office are chiefly external or moral, as if Titus were in danger of appointing persons whose character was blamable. Instead of implying a nascent state of Christianity and ecclesiastical order, they suppose doctrinal knowledge and Christian instruction. The epistle is so vague and indefinite in its statements, that it could have been of little use to Titus. Had it contained specific instruc-

tions respecting the mode of combating and refuting the heretics, or presented general principles in their application to the circumstances of the evangelist, its relevancy would be apparent. Commonplaces and the enforcement of practical Christianity are things which Titus himself did not need, else his long association with Paul had been of little benefit to him. A bishop is to hold fast the 'faithful word' and to maintain 'sound doctrine.' What these expressions imply is not described. Titus should exhort young men to be sober-minded; was this precept necessary for *him*? He is commanded to avoid foolish questions, etc. etc., but the nature of the questions is unnoticed, and how they are foolish is not specified. The pointlessness of the directions must have made them all but worthless to an evangelist.

AUTHENTICITY.

The authenticity of the epistle will be considered along with that of the two to Timothy. In modern times it was first denied by Eichhorn, who followed up the critical method of Schleiermacher concerning the first letter to Timothy.

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

TIME OF WRITING.

IT WILL be shown hereafter that the epistle was not written soon after Paul had left Ephesus (Acts xviii. 19) in Phrygia or Galatia; nor on the way to Macedonia, or at some place in it (Acts xx. 1, 2); nor in Macedonia during a visit not recorded in the Acts, which took place after his second arrival at Ephesus; nor while he was in captivity at Cæsarea; nor in a supposed second imprisonment at Rome. The difficulties of these hypotheses have proved great to such as assume the authenticity of the epistle; and are likely to remain barriers to it.

A comparison of the letter with the acknowledged Pauline ones, either with the earlier to the Corinthians, Romans, and Galatians; or the later to the Philippians, shows a different condition of the Christian Church. In the one case we see its nascent form; in the other a more settled order. In the one, the Church was still in a transition state; in the other it had 'the form of sound words' and a developed ecclesiastical organisation. Hence most critics incline to a late date. To get an early one by inserting the work somewhere in the history of the Acts seems to clash with the general tone of the letter, which is historically intelligible only in case of a late date, because the polemic directed against the false teachers shows that they had appeared as open advocates of erroneous tenets for some time.

The state of the Ephesian church as seen from the epistle, with its well-developed organisation, indicates the lapse of a considerable period since its origin. Emoluments were attached to offices; and false teachers, different from the Judaisers with whom Paul contended, errorists who held Gnostic views, had made an impression on the church.

In the first epistle, the same persons, doctrines, and practices are censured as in the second. The same commands, instructions, and encouragements are given to Timothy in both. The same remedy for the corruptions which had taken place among the Ephesians, is prescribed in them. As in the second so in the first, everything is addressed to Timothy as superintendent. This implies that the state of things among the Ephesians was similar when the two epistles were written. Accordingly the first and second were written within a slight interval, apparently not long before the apostle's death.

OBJECT.

The leading object of the letter was to counteract the false teachers who had appeared at Ephesus, and to instruct Timothy how to manage the affairs of the church. The evangelist is enjoined to charge some that they must teach none other than apostolic doctrine, and to withstand every injurious influence.

Do the contents agree with this object? They do not, in the opinion of De Wette. And he is partly right. The directions respecting the false teachers are vague. They themselves are not described in definite colours; nor are their opinions clearly stated, except in iv. 3. Sometimes they are spoken of as future, sometimes as present. The writer turns away from them to Timothy himself, then comes back to them, and digresses again. In an epistle to a familiar friend it is unreasonable to look for systematic arrangement of

materials or logical connection. We expect the freedom and familiarity of the epistolary style. But that ought not to prevent direct and valuable counsels; nor obviate the need of advice expressly counteracting the false doctrines taught by the heretics. The evangelist required special directions in the critical circumstances he was placed in—directions which would go to the root of the questions agitated. As the heretics are referred to in general terms, the way in which Timothy was to deal with them is vaguely described. The qualifications of church-officers are indeed stated at length; but that subject was easily understood. The evangelist must have known of himself the moral qualifications of elders and other office-bearers. The 5th chapter is the most valuable and appropriate, though not free from perfunctory exhortations. And then Timothy himself is addressed as a novice who is to keep himself pure and to use a little wine for health's sake. On the whole, the letter is not well adapted to its leading purpose, because it is vague, general, discursive. The directions in it often want point, pertinence, and value. What would have most benefited Timothy is withheld; what would have served him least is given, unless we believe that his knowledge was so elementary and his principles so feeble as to need admonitions against the love of money and the foolish lusts it induces. Exhortations to seize hold of eternal life, not to neglect the gift he had received, and to meditate upon the precepts given him, were superfluous.

ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS.

As no systematic arrangement is observable in the epistle, the same topics being introduced at different places without any apparent reason for the abruptness with which they occur, it is difficult to discover the proper connection and sequence of parts. The order

of topics is often perplexing, and creates no small difficulty in interpretation. Perhaps the letter cannot be divided more conveniently than into six parts, coinciding with its six chapters.

(1) i. 3–20 ; (2) ii. 1–15 ; (3) iii. ; (4) iv. ; (5) v.; (6) vi.

After the inscription and salutation the writer reminds Timothy of the commission he had been left to execute at Ephesus, viz. to oppose the false teachers, warning them to abide by apostolic doctrine, to give no attention to idle and puerile superstitions which promote contention, but to keep in view godly edification. The end of the divine law is kindness ; from which such as turn aside involve themselves and others in irritating disputes, while they pretend to be teachers of the law. The law was not meant for those who seek salvation through faith in Christ but for such as continue in sin. That it was not made to fetter the righteous but the disobedient, accords with the gospel of which Paul had been made a preacher even after he had been a persecutor—a thing he could not think of without the greatest gratitude. But because he acted in ignorance, he was mercifully pardoned—an example of Christ's long-suffering that future sinners might not be discouraged. The author then breaks out into a strain of praise to God. He reminds Timothy that he had committed a work to him agreeably to certain divine indications respecting his future fidelity ; and he did not doubt that he would keep a pure faith and good conscience, though some had made shipwreck of both, particularly Hymeneus and Alexander, whom the apostle had solemnly excommunicated (i. 3–20).

2. He gives directions about public worship, prescribing intercession for all men, especially for kings and persons in authority. God himself wills that all should be saved. There is one and the same God for all ; one and the same Mediator, who died for all. The

mention of Christ's ransom leads him to speak of his own commission as an apostle of the Gentiles. He wishes that men should offer public prayer in every place of assembling, with holiness and charity; that the women should wear decent and modest apparel, abstaining from finery and ornament; their chief glory being good works. Women should learn but never teach in the church; and be always in subjection, since the woman was created for the man, and led the man into transgression. Notwithstanding this inferior position and her helping to mislead the man, he intimates that the way of salvation is open to her through motherhood (ii.).

3. The writer now describes the qualifications and character of office-bearers in the church. In coveting so good an office, a bishop should be blameless, only once married, vigilant, sober, moderate, hospitable, capable of teaching, not addicted to wine, no striker, not covetous, not a brawler, patient, ruling his household well, not a recent convert to Christianity lest he should grow proud. He should also have a good name in society. Deacons are also described, who should be proved by time. Deaconesses should be grave, not slanderers, sober and faithful in all their relations. The deacons should be once married, and good rulers of their families; for those who conduct themselves well in the office obtain a good degree in blessedness, and great confidence in the faith (iii. 1–13). The next three verses form an appendix to the preceding, in which the author informs Timothy that he had written to him, expecting to visit him shortly; that the evangelist might know how to conduct himself in the church, which is the pillar and ground of truth. With this is loosely connected a sentence respecting the Logos who was manifested in the flesh (iii. 14–16).

4. He returns to the false teachers of whom he had spoken in the first chapter, but hints that they are future rather than present. The spirit of prophecy pre-

dicted that some should apostatise from the faith, advocating doctrines of demoniacal origin; hypocritical, lying speakers, with the mark of guilt burnt in their consciences.' These pernicious heretics prohibit marriage, enjoin abstinence from flesh, and practise asceticism. In refuting their second error, the author asserts that every creature of God fit for eating is good, and not to be refused. Timothy is warned against erroneous doctrine; he is to reject childish tales in religion and occupy himself with spiritual purity rather than outward sanctity sought through bodily mortifications. He is reminded that bodily penance is of no avail; but that true godliness has a blessing in both worlds. The apostle laboured and was reproached because he trusted in God the Saviour of all. These things Timothy ought to teach, and to behave so that no man might despise his youth. He was to be an example to the Christians; improving his spiritual gifts by study, and recommending the doctrine he taught (iv.).

5. Timothy's prudence should appear in entreating aged persons in a filial manner to comply with their duties; in dealing with young men in the spirit of affectionate familiarity; in treating the elder women as mothers, the younger as sisters, with all purity. He is to see that widows friendless and desolate, should be provided for. Such of them as have children or nephews are to be maintained by the latter; such as are wholly desolate ought to trust in God; but she that lives in pleasure is dead to the cause of Christ. The writer then passes to the selection of widows for the office of female elders. They are not to be chosen under sixty, having been married but once, and well spoken of. Younger widows are disqualified; for when they become wanton they will marry again. Hence they are spoken of severely. They are therefore to marry again, that they may bear children and bring no reproach on Christianity. Should any have widows related to them

otherwise than as mothers or aunts, such are to support them without applying to the church for relief. The elders who rule well and teach deserve a double portion. Timothy is to listen to no accusation against an elder unless it could be proved before two or three witnesses. Respecting discipline generally, notorious sinners are to be rebuked publicly. In receiving back the excommunicated he is warned against rashness and haste. And that he might be a proper censor of others he is directed to be himself free from inordinate enjoyments; but without countenancing asceticism (v. 1–23). The last two verses contain remarks about different ways of discovering the true character of men (24, 25).

6. He enjoins Christian slaves to remain faithful to their heathen masters, lest reproach be brought on the cause of Christ. Christian masters being brethren are to be treated with all the more respect. Should heretics inculcate aught but the true doctrine, they are censured in direct terms by the apostle as ignorant, fond of disputation, and falling in with the prejudices of their hearers, counting that to be godliness which brings them most gain. In opposition to such, he declares that godliness with contentment is indeed great gain; but the love of riches leads to destruction. This exhortation to contentment, meant to cheer Timothy himself as we see from vi. 11–16, is resumed at the seventeenth verse. The evangelist is to remind the rich of their obligations to be generous, that they may obtain an everlasting inheritance. The writer concludes with an allusion to the false teachers, enjoining Timothy to avoid their idle dreams; and with a benediction.

AUTHENTICITY.

The first scholar in modern times who made a formal attack on the authenticity of this epistle was Schleiermacher; and many feeling the force of his arguments

adopted the same opinion. Though his acuteness led him to exaggerate defects in the letter, the substance of his remarks is now accepted by critics. It is best to discuss the authorship of the three letters together.

AUTHENTICITY OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

The authenticity of the epistles is bound up with two things, viz. the historical credibility of Paul's second imprisonment, and their date within the part of his life covered by the Acts. The following is a summary of the evidence in favour of Paul's second imprisonment.

Clement of Rome is the most important and ancient authority. He is quoted in favour of a journey which the apostle made to Spain, and therefore of a second imprisonment. The passage bearing on the point occurs in the fifth chapter of his epistle to the Corinthians.

'Through envy and strife Paul exhibited the reward of patience, after wearing bonds seven times, after being put to flight and stoned. Having preached the gospel both in the east and west, he received the glorious renown due to his faith, having taught righteousness to the whole world, and having come to the boundary of the west, and having borne his testimony before the rulers. Thus he departed out of the world, and went his way to that holy place, after exhibiting in his person the greatest pattern of patience.'[1]

This passage has given rise to much discussion, especially as the language is neither precise nor definite. Intended for popular effect, it is rhetorical. The two disputed phrases are 'before the rulers' and 'the boundary of the west.' The former has been applied to in-

[1] *διὰ ζῆλον καὶ ἔριν Παῦλος ὑπομονῆς βραβεῖον ἔδειξεν· ἑπτάκις δεσμὰ φορέσας, φυγαδευθεὶς, λιθασθεὶς. κῆρυξ γενόμενος ἔν τε τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ δύσει, τὸ γενναῖον τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ κλέος ἔλαβεν, δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθών, καὶ μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων· οὕτως ἀπηλλάγη τοῦ κόσμου καὶ εἰς τὸν ἅγιον τόπον ἐπορεύθη, ὑπομονῆς γενόμενος μέγιστος ὑπογραμμός.*

dividuals, either to Helius and Polycletus who governed Rome during Nero's absence; or to the prefects Tigellinus and Nymphidius Sabinus. Probably it alludes to the persons in power at Rome—the Roman authorities generally not excluding the emperor. The latter phrase is more difficult, *the boundary of the west.* Does this mean Illyricum, or the extreme boundary of the west as distinguished from its interior; or Italy generally, including Rome; or Spain? The first two explanations are unnatural; and the participle *having come* is unfavourable to Spain. Clement writing from Rome should have said *having gone* not *having come.* Besides, as Mr. Tate has observed: 'East and west are relative terms, which can only be understood by ascertaining the point of reference in the mind of the speaker; as that again must be determined by knowing him and his notions on the subject, the notions also of the persons addressed, and even those of the parties who are the subjects of discourse. Keeping all this in mind, we may fairly ask, when Clement himself, more an eastern than a western, writes concerning Paul, whose chief labours had lain in the east, to the Corinthians, whose position naturally gave them an eastward inclination, would those Corinthians, on reading the passage here exhibited, without any significant hint from the context, discover in the words [to the end of the west], that not imperial Rome, but some obscure spot in remote Spain, was then intended? All circumstances fully taken into consideration, I affirm that they could not so understand the language of Clement: nor if such had been his meaning in writing to them, could he ever have left it in words of such inevitable certainty. Spain was very little likely to be known or thought of on the coasts of the Ægean sea; Rome must have formed the limit of their general acquaintance with the west.'[1] Again, the three successive clauses, 'thus

[1] *Continuous History of St. Paul*, pp. 178, 179.

he left the world,' 'having borne his testimony before the rulers,' 'having come to the boundary of the west,' are each connected with its predecessor and refer apparently to the same locality. If the first alludes to his death at Rome, the others point to the place of that death. The writer affirms of the apostle, that after preaching in the east and west he obtained the glorious renown due to his faith. Repeating the idea, he says that Paul taught righteousness to the whole world, i.e. to the east and west. Then to explain more particularly the reception of the renown due to his faith, Clement proceeds to say that having come to the boundary of the west, and having borne witness before the rulers (there), he left the world. Thus the locality of the testimony before rulers is included in that denoted by the limit of the west. The boundary of the west is the western part of the empire generally.

The author's language is inflated, and magnifies the apostle Paul as a preacher who taught the truth throughout the whole world. One who uses hyperbole does not express his meaning with prosaic precision; so that 'the boundary of the west' need not be applied to to one particular place. If the writer thought of such, it was Rome; if not, he meant the west generally, Italy and Rome.

Eusebius did not understand Clement's words of Spain, for the historian has, 'There is a report,'[1] without appealing to Clement's authority, and it is hardly possible that he was ignorant of the epistle. That the limit of the west means or includes Britain is still more improbable.

The reference to a journey into Spain is more definite in the Muratorian fragment on the canon. But the mutilated state of the text detracts from the value of it. Speaking of the Acts of the Apostles written by Luke, the unknown author says, 'But the acts of all the

[1] λόγος ἔχει.

apostles were written in one book. Luke relates to the excellent Theophilus the things that fell under his own notice; and he evidently declares as apart from his purpose the martyrdom of Peter, and the departure of Paul setting out from the city to Spain.'[1]

The interpretation of this passage must be obscure as long as the text is corrupt. All admit that it needs emendation, and according to the character of the emendation will be the sense attached to it. A word or words are wanting at the end; it may be 'omittit,' *omits*, which agrees best with the preceding *but* (but omits the journey of Paul to Spain). In any case, the fragmentist is a witness for Paul's journey to Spain; but the tradition about Peter in his time, shows that any credible account of Paul's death, if there were such at Rome, had disappeared.

No writer prior to the fourth century mentions the apostle's release from captivity. Eusebius writes: 'After pleading his cause, he is said to have departed again on the ministry of preaching, and, after a second visit to the same city, he finished his life with martyrdom. While he was a prisoner he wrote his second epistle to Timothy, in which he both mentions his first defence and his impending exaltation to glory. Hear on these points his own testimony respecting himself: "At my first defence none was present with me, but all deserted me. May it not be laid to their charge. But the Lord was with me and strengthened me, that through me the preaching of the gospel might be fulfilled, and all the nations might hear it." He plainly sets forth in these words, "On the former occasion I was rescued from the lion's mouth, that the preaching of the gospel might be accomplished," that it was Nero to whom he referred by this expression,

[1] 'Acta autem omnium apostolorum sub uno libro scripta sunt. Lucas optime Theophile (optimo Theophilo) comprendit quia (quæ) sub præsentia ejus singula gerebantur, sicut et semote passionem Petri evidenter declarat, sed profectionem Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam proficiscentis.'—See Credner's *Geschichte des Neutestamentl. Kanon*, p. 155.

as is probable on account of his cruelty. Therefore he did not subsequently append any such expression as "he will rescue me from the lion's mouth," for he saw in spirit how near his approaching death was. Hence after the expression, "and I was rescued from the lion's mouth," this also, "the Lord will rescue me from every evil work, and will save me unto his heavenly kingdom," indicating the approaching martyrdom. . . . . Thus much we have said to show, that the apostle's martyrdom did not take place at that period of his stay at Rome when Luke wrote his history.'[1]

Several points in this paragraph demand attention.

First. Eusebius seems to have had no historical ground for his opinion. He quotes no preceding writer, but states it as *a report* or *saying* that the apostle set out from Rome again.

Secondly. In another place, in which the historian enumerates the parts of the world where the apostles preached, he says, 'Why should we speak of Paul spreading the gospel of Christ from Jerusalem to Illyricum, and finally suffering martyrdom at Rome under Nero? This account is given by Origen, in the third book of his "Exposition of Genesis."' Hence we conclude that Origen knew nothing of a second captivity.

Thirdly. Eusebius appeals to the second epistle to Timothy in confirmation of his view, so that probably it was nothing more than an hypothesis, for the purpose of explaining the difficulties in that epistle. Schrader and Göschen attribute the conjecture to the historian's desire of reconciling his false chronology, which places Paul's arrival at Rome in the first year of Nero's reign, with the fact of the apostle's death at the end of it. In his 'Chronicon' he makes Festus succeed Felix as governor of Judea in the year of Claudius's death (A.D. 54), and places the beginning of the Roman captivity in the spring of 55. But Paul's martyrdom

[1] *Hist. Eccles.* ii. 22.

is assigned to the thirteenth of Nero (A.D. 67). Hence if the apostle were not released, twelve years' residence in Rome must be accounted for. The historian seized on the floating tradition, not only to help the solution of difficulties in the second epistle to Timothy, but to make his chronology consistent.

It is useless to quote the testimonies of Jerome, Chrysostom and others, because they are resolvable into that of Eusebius. After the historian, several particulars were added to the tradition, and it soon became general. An itinerary of the apostle Paul is prefixed to the Euthalian edition of the Acts, containing no second imprisonment. Primasius, a disciple of Augustine, shows in his comments on Rom. xv. 24 and 2 Tim. iv. 17, that he was not a believer in the apostle's liberation from prison; and Cyril of Jerusalem speaks only of the apostle's *willingness* to extend his preaching to Spain. Innocent I., a western himself, knew nothing of a journey into Spain, or any other parts except such as are consistent with a single imprisonment at Rome. These facts favour, indirectly, the opinion that the captivity spoken of in the Acts was the only one.

The evidence for a second captivity resolves itself into the contents of the three epistles, which cannot be brought into harmony with the apostle's situation either before or during the imprisonment noticed at the close of the Acts. Paul's release and other journeys consequent upon it together with a second imprisonment arose from exegetical difficulties inherent in the epistles themselves. These, with the apostle's expressed desire to visit Spain (Rom. xv. 24), seem to have suggested the hypothesis.

1. The first epistle to Timothy informs the reader that he was at Ephesus when he received it. Paul, intending to go to Macedonia, had left him there: 'As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they

teach no other doctrine' (i. 3). Hence the letter was written soon after the author travelled from Ephesus towards or to Macedonia.

The first occasion on which Paul visited Ephesus is noticed in Acts xviii. 19, after he had left Cenchrea. Departing from it, he visited Cæsarea and Antioch, and travelled through Galatia and Phrygia. Calvin supposes that he wrote the letter in the last-named locality. Thus the sojourn at Ephesus, in Acts xviii. 19, is pronounced identical with that in 1 Tim. i. 3.

This opinion is untenable, because the epistle supposes that the church at Ephesus had existed for a considerable time, a fact disagreeing with Acts xviii. 19–21, xix. 1, etc. The church was hardly organised during this first visit. Not a hint is dropped about Timothy being then left behind at Ephesus, though it is stated that Aquila and his wife were left. Neither did the apostle go from Ephesus to Macedonia on this occasion; which is contrary to 1 Tim. i. 3.

2. A commoner opinion connects the composition of the epistle with the apostle's second visit to Ephesus, mentioned in Acts xx. 1 (compared with xix. 1–41). At this time he did depart to go into Macedonia, in accordance with i. 3. Hence the letter is thought to have been composed while Paul was on his way to Macedonia, or in Macedonia (Acts xx. 1, 2). But insuperable difficulties are opposed.

(*a.*) The superscription of the second epistle to the Corinthians seems to show that at the time Paul is supposed to have written the first epistle to Timothy, Timothy was with him in Macedonia. There is little doubt that the second epistle to the Corinthians was written soon after the apostle's arrival in Macedonia. But in the salutation with which it opens Timothy is associated with the writer and consequently could not be left behind at Ephesus. And as to the only solution of the difficulty that can be thought of, viz. that Timothy,

though left behind at Ephesus on Paul's departure from Asia, might yet follow him so soon after as to come up with him in Macedonia before he wrote to the Corinthians; that supposition is inconsistent with the terms and tenor of the epistle, which uniformly speaks of his intention to return to Timothy at Ephesus, not of his expecting Timothy to come to him in Macedonia (1 Tim. iii. 14, 15; iv. 13).

(*b.*) When Paul wrote the first epistle to Timothy, he intended to return soon to Ephesus. Neither the Acts nor epistles mention another visit to the place. He never expresses such hope or purpose elsewhere; nor is there any hint of its being fulfilled. It is of no avail to say that some unforeseen accident detained him; because that is improbable by the side of other statements respecting his abiding in Greece and journey to Jerusalem (1 Cor. xvi. 6, 7; Acts xix. 21; xx. 16), statements made about the time when he is supposed to have spoken to Timothy of his intention to return shortly to Ephesus.

(*c.*) Paul charges Timothy to abide at Ephesus till his return, for the purpose of conducting the affairs of the church in his absence and of establishing it in the faith. According to the present hypothesis, he speedily abandoned the post and went to Paul who was still in Macedonia (2 Cor. i. 1). In this way the object of the letter was frustrated.

(*d.*) Timothy does not seem to have been at Ephesus when Paul left it for Macedonia, for he had been sent forward shortly before the apostle left Ephesus, into Macedonia (Acts xix. 22).

3. Others place the journey to Macedonia within the three years' stay at Ephesus (Acts xix.). The visit in question did not occur towards the commencement of the three years as Mosheim supposes, but after the lapse of two years, because the relations of the church, its organisation, and the origin of the errors alluded to

demand a lengthened abode on the part of the apostle. Such is Wieseler's opinion.[1]

The frequency with which Paul is made to visit Macedonia, either in person or by deputies, militates against the hypothesis. During the same stay at Ephesus he sent Timothy and Erastus into Macedonia but remained himself (Acts xix. 22) ; and after leaving Ephesus, he went over all Macedonia, giving much exhortation to the believers (Acts xx. 1, 2). The hypothesis adds one visit more to his personal and vicarious ones to Macedonia about the same period. Wieseler makes the apostle travel from Ephesus to Corinth through Macedonia ; to which Huther properly objects, that it makes the apostle be present in Corinth shortly before the composition of the first epistle to the Corinthians, so that the occasion for writing it becomes void ; that Acts xx. 29, 30, is against it, because erroneous doctrines had been already propagated in the church, according to the first epistle to Timothy, whereas the passage in the Acts represents them as still future ; and that by the same hypothesis, Paul separated himself from Timothy only for a short time, and after his return must have sent him away soon from Ephesus ; contrary to the contents of 1 Tim., which suppose that Timothy was to superintend the church at Ephesus for a considerable time. In proportion as the false doctrines threatened to destroy the church, does it appear the more unsuitable that Paul should have withdrawn Timothy from his sphere of labour, soon after giving him instructions appropriate to a lengthened ministry there.

Such are the exegetical difficulties against an insertion of the first epistle in any part of Paul's public life, as far as we know it from the Acts or his own letters.

Similar obstacles in the second epistle to Timothy prevent the belief that it was written before or during the writer's first captivity.

[1] *Chronologie des apostolischen Zeitalters*, pp. 286–315.

1. 'Trophimus have I left at Miletus sick' (2 Tim. iv. 20). This could not have happened on the journey to Jerusalem, because Trophimus was with Paul at that city (Acts xxi. 29); and he did not touch at Miletus in the voyage from Cæsarea to Italy.

2. 'Erastus abode at Corinth' (2 Tim. iv. 20). This language implies that Paul passed through Corinth on his way to Rome and left Erastus there. But the apostle had not been at Corinth for several years before his imprisonment at Rome. Passing from Cæsarea to Italy he did not touch at the capital of Achaia. Since his last visit to Corinth also, Timothy had been with him; so that he had no need to write to Timothy about that visit (Acts xx. 4).

3. 'The cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee; and the books, but especially the parchments' (2 Tim. iv. 13). Here the visit to Troas mentioned in Acts xx. 5–7 seems intended. If so, the articles must have been allowed to be there for seven or eight years; which is improbable, as the books were evidently of importance.

4. 'I have sent Tychicus to Ephesus' (iv. 12). This could not have been when Tychicus carried the epistle to Colossæ, because Timothy was with Paul at Rome at that time (Coloss. i. 1), and the apostle could not have mentioned Tychicus's mission to Timothy then absent. Hence a later mission must be intended, one not alluded to in the Acts or epistles.

5. Paul's situation when he wrote the epistle does not accord with his treatment as it appears in the Acts, nor with any period of the imprisonment there described.

6. The letter to the Philippians expresses a hope that the writer would soon visit them (ii. 24); which disagrees with 2 Tim. iv. 6: 'I am now ready to be offered and the time of my departure is at hand.'

It is thus impossible to find a suitable place for the epistle before or after Paul's imprisonment at Rome.

The exegetical difficulties in the epistle to Titus are equally irreconcilable with its composition during the known life of the apostle.

1. The epistle to Titus was not written during the apostle's sojourn at Corinth of eighteen months, mentioned in Acts xviii. 1–18. While there Paul, it is supposed, went to Crete, and left Titus in the island. On returning to Corinth, he was driven into Epirus by a storm, and wrote the present letter either in Nicopolis or its neighbourhood. The succeeding winter he spent in Nicopolis, preached about that time as far as Illyricum, and returned to Corinth.

This cannot be admitted, because the verb *continued* (Acts xviii. 11) is opposed to the idea of a voyage to Crete during that abode; because very little of the eighteen months is left for Corinth itself; and because Apollos was not then acquainted with Paul, as the epistle supposes he was (Titus iii. 13).

2. Hug thinks that Paul, after leaving Corinth, went to Ephesus (Acts xviii. 19), stopping at Crete by the way. He wrote the letter in Ephesus, announcing his design to spend the winter at Nicopolis in Cilicia, after he had visited Jerusalem and Antioch. But why should Paul, sailing from Corinth for Syria (Acts xviii. 18, 19), have turned aside from the usual course and digressed to Crete? Besides, Paul and Apollos did not meet at Ephesus, the former having left before the latter arrived; whereas, according to this opinion, they *did* meet there and separate, the one departing for Syria, the other to Corinth by Crete.

3. Others, including Wieseler, insert the journey to Crete and the composition of the letter in the three years' abode at Ephesus (Acts xix. 1–41).

Against this it may be urged, that Paul wrote to Titus to continue in Crete, till he should send Artemas and Tychicus to him, and then to come to Nicopolis. But he afterwards sent for him to Ephesus, recalling

him very soon from a sphere in which he had been recently placed. It is also improbable that Paul should take up his winter quarters in Nicopolis, a city where he had not been before, and in relation to which he did not know how he should be received.

4. Others think that Paul made a voyage to Crete after he left Ephesus, before arriving in Greece. Baronius conjectures that he went into Greece from Macedonia (Acts xx. 2), not by land, but by sea, sailing to Crete by the Ægean sea. When he came to Greece, he wrote the present epistle to Titus, either at Nicopolis, or some place not far distant.

According to this view, Paul leaving Macedonia went to Crete, came back to Greece, travelled to Epirus, wintered in Nicopolis, repaired to Achaia, and passed some time there, whence he returned to Macedonia. All this occupied a considerable time, yet the writer of the Acts specifies no more than three months in Greece, which are not sufficient.

5. Others place the voyage to Crete during the three months passed in Greece (Acts xx. 2, 3); and the writing of the epistle either at Troas or Nicopolis.

It is improbable that Paul undertook such a voyage in winter when the sea was dangerous. Before he left Ephesus he had the idea of going to Jerusalem (1 Cor. xvi. 4): while at Corinth he still proposed to do so. Why should he have abandoned his design so soon? The three months' residence in Corinth was short enough for the place itself; and the epistles to the Corinthians show that his presence was much needed there.

These are the chief difficulties which lie against the composition of the epistle to Titus being preceded by a voyage to Crete, at any period anterior to or within the apostle's imprisonment at Rome. Putting together the exegetical embarrassments arising out of

the three epistles, the case is strong against their origin within the known life of Paul.

It will be observed that the evidence now adduced in favour of the apostle's release and second imprisonment is merely negative, compelling the critic to look for some conjectural method of accounting for the origin of the epistles during his life. If the release were supported by history, the case would assume another aspect ; but we have seen that it is not. There is no positive evidence that the epistles were written after the apostle's liberation. If it be said that the epistles themselves furnish such evidence, they do not present it otherwise than by an assumption that they are authentic, which is the very thing to be proved. It is possible that the epistles might support the idea of a second imprisonment, if they bore evidence of their Pauline authorship. Only on that condition can they be considered as favourable to the hypothesis of a part of the apostle's life being omitted in the Acts. We are therefore shut up to the positive evidence of the epistles for or against their authenticity. Do they possess the characteristics of a Pauline origin ? If they do, we must assume that the apostle was released, and made several journeys not recorded in the Acts, that he came to Rome again, was imprisoned and suffered death. If they do not, the entire hypothesis must be looked upon as a fiction, intended to prop up the authenticity of writings.

One argument approaching the nature of positive evidence for the apostle's release and consequent second imprisonment, has been found in 2 Tim. iv. 16, 17 : 'At my first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me : I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge. Notwithstanding the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me, that by me the preaching might be fully known, and that all the Gentiles might hear, and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion.'

Here it is said that he had got a hearing and had been discharged, and that he was then permitted to preach the gospel, so that all the Gentiles would hear it. The interpretation is doubtful. The words may refer to a hearing he had in his first captivity, when he was rescued from imminent peril, not set at liberty, and that all the Gentiles would come to know the gospel indirectly through Rome, because it was the centre and metropolis of heathenism. The eighteenth verse favours the latter view, because its language connects the present imprisonment closely and immediately with that very one during which he had been delivered from danger.

In opposition to the preceding argument for the apostle's release, we may mention the improbability of so much being repeated during the supposed second imprisonment, of what had happened in the first. It must be assumed that each time Timothy and Mark were not with the apostle at first but joined him afterwards; that Luke was with him each time; and that on both occasions Tychicus was sent to Asia. We must also assume, says Hug, that Paul at both times, even in the latter part of Nero's reign, was permitted to receive friends during his incarceration; to write letters and despatch messengers. Nor is it likely that the apostle should have survived the persecution of the Christians under Nero, which followed the burning of the city. In Rome he was too conspicuous not to be seized at once. If he was absent and had afterwards returned, he would scarcely have been treated in the way the second epistle implies; for even while writing it, he had considerable privileges. Hence it is most precarious to date the second epistle to Timothy after the burning of Rome, July 19, A.D. 64, supposing it to be Pauline.

As neither expedient agrees with the apostle's liberation from his Roman captivity under Nero; ecclesiastical tradition aided by exegetical conjecture, or the

apportionment of the pastoral epistles to intervals of his ministry; a second captivity must be banished to the realm of fable, to which Reuss assigns it with justifiable confidence.[1]

We shall now adduce the external and internal evidence for and against the authenticity.

Allusions to the pastoral epistles have been found in Clement of Rome: 'Let us therefore come to him in holiness of soul, lifting up to him chaste and undefiled hands' (1 Tim. ii. 8).[2]

'He that shall do this will procure for himself great glory in the Lord, and every place will receive him' (1 Tim. iii. 13).[3]

'Let us consider what is good, and what agreeable and acceptable before him that made us' (1 Tim. v. 4).[4]

'Ye were ready unto every good work' (Titus iii. 1).[5]

These allusions are too uncertain to be relied upon, so that De Gebhardt and Harnack suggest the derivation of the Clementine and Scripture statements from the same source.

Ignatius is the next author adduced as a witness for the existence of the pastoral letters prior to his time.

'Crocus has in all things refreshed me, as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ shall also refresh him' (2 Tim. i. 16–18).[6]

Other places from Ignatius are sometimes quoted,

[1] See his essay 'La seconde Captivité de S. Paul,' in the Strassburg *Revue de Théologie*, ii. p. 150, etc.

[2] *προσέλθωμεν οὖν αὐτῷ ἐν ὁσιότητι ψυχῆς, ἁγνὰς καὶ ἀμιάντους χεῖρας αἴροντες πρὸς αὐτόν.—Epist. 1 ad Cor.* c. 29.

[3] .... *τοῦτο ὁ ποιήσας, ἑαυτῷ μέγα κλέος ἐν Κυρίῳ περιποιήσεται, καὶ πᾶς τόπος δέξεται αὐτόν.—Ibid.* c. 54.

[4] *βλέπωμεν τί καλόν, καὶ τί τερπνὸν καὶ προσδεκτὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ ποιήσαντος ἡμᾶς.—Ibid.* c. 7.

[5] *ἕτοιμοι εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν.—Ibid.* c. 2.

[6] *καὶ Κρόκος δὲ .... κατὰ πάντα με ἀνέπαυσεν, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸν ὁ πατὴρ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀναψύξαι.—Ad Ephes.* c. 2.

which have no visible connection with the supposed originals. The one just given is uncertain.

In his epistle to the Philippians Polycarp has, 'The love of money is the beginning of all evils. Knowing, therefore, that as we brought nothing into the world, so neither can we carry anything out,' etc. (1 Tim. vi. 7, 10).[1]

Again: 'Pray for all the saints; pray also for kings, and powers, and princes' (1 Tim. ii. 1, 2).[2]

'According as he has promised us that he will raise us up from the dead, and that if we walk worthy of him, we shall also reign with him, if we believe' (2 Tim. ii. 11, 12).[3]

'For they loved not this present world' (2 Tim. iv. 10).[4]

The first of these passages agrees so nearly with the supposed original, that the similarity cannot have been accidental. What is the date of Polycarp's letter? Ritschl has shown that it is between A.D. 160 and 170, after Polycarp's death. The quotation may therefore be allowed, in opposition to Schleiermacher and Baur who try to neutralise it.

Eusebius introduces Hegesippus in this manner: 'The same author relating the events of the times, also says that the Church continued until then as a pure and uncorrupt virgin; whilst, if there were any at all that attempted to pervert the sound doctrine of the saving gospel, they were yet skulking in dark retreats. . . But when the sacred choir of apostles became extinct, and the generation of those who had been privileged to hear their inspired wisdom had passed away, then also the

[1] *ἀρχὴ δὲ πάντων χαλεπῶν φιλαργυρία· εἰδότες οὖν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἰσηνέγκαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐξενεγκεῖν τι ἔχομεν, ὁπλισώμεθα τοῖς ὅπλοις τῆς δικαιοσύνης.*—Cap. 4.

[2] *ὑπερ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων προσεύχεσθε. προσεύχεσθε καὶ ὑπερ βασιλέων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ ἀρχόντων.*—*Ibid.* c. 12.

[3] *καθὼς ὑπέσχετο ἡμῖν ἐγεῖραι ἡμᾶς ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ ὅτι ἐὰν πολιτευσώμεθα ἀξίως αὐτοῦ, καὶ συμβασιλεύσομεν αὐτῷ, εἴγε πιστεύομεν.*—*Ibid.* c. 5.

[4] *οὐ γὰρ τὸν νῦν ἠγάπησαν αἰῶνα.*—*Ibid.* c. 9.

combinations of impious error arose by the fraud and delusion of false teachers. These also, as there was none of the apostles left, henceforth attempted with uncovered head to preach their science falsely so called, against the gospel of truth.' [1]

On this passage Baur founds the following argument against the authenticity of the pastoral epistles. Hegesippus (A.D. 160–170) states that till the time of Trajan the Church was a pure virgin, and that *science falsely so called* did not rear its head till all the apostles were removed. How could the historian say so, had Paul, as the author of the pastoral epistles, designated by the name of *science falsely so called* a thing existing in his day? And as other expressions in the passage resemble some in the epistles, it can only be assumed, either that Hegesippus had the letters before him, or their author had the work of Hegesippus. But Hegesippus, who was an Ebionite, would scarcely have used a Pauline epistle; and therefore the pastoral letters copied from Hegesippus.[2] The phrase *science falsely so called* leads directly to the Gnostics of the time of Trajan.

Granting that Hegesippus was a Jewish Christian, we see no great difficulty in supposing that he read the pastoral epistles written in Paul's name and remembered some of their expressions, though he may have paid little attention to them. It is enough that he remembered the phrase, *science falsely so called*;[3] and that *the delusion of false teachers*,[4] *sound canon of the saving gospel*,[5]

[1] ἐπὶ τούτοις ὁ αὐτὸς ἀνὴρ διηγούμενος τὰ κατὰ τοὺς δηλουμένους ἐπιλέγει ὡς ἄρα μέχρι τῶν τότε χρόνων παρθένος καθαρὰ καὶ ἀδιάφθορος ἔμεινεν ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἐν ἀδήλῳ που σκότει φωλευόντων εἰσέτι τότε . . . . ὡς δ' ὁ ἱερὸς τῶν ἀποστόλων χορὸς διάφορον εἰλήφει τοῦ βίου τέλος, πυρεληλύθει τε ἡ γενεὰ ἐκείνη τῶν αὐταῖς ἀκοαῖς τῆς ἐνθέου σοφίας ἐπακοῦσαι κατηξιωμένων, τηνικαῦτα τῆς ἀθέου πλάνης τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐλάμβανεν ἡ σύστασις, διὰ τῆς τῶν ἑτεροδιδασκάλων ἀπάτης· οἱ καὶ ἅτε μηδενὸς ἔτι τῶν ἀποστόλων λειπομένου, γυμνῇ λοιπὸν ἤδη τῇ κεφαλῇ, τῷ τῆς ἀληθείας κηρύγματι τὴν ψευδώνυμον γνῶσιν ἀντικηρύττειν ἐπεχείρουν.—*Hist. Eccles.* iii. 32.

[2] *Paulus der Apostel*, p. 494.

[3] ψευδώνυμος γνώσις.

[4] ἡ τῶν ἑτεροδιδασκάλων ἀπάτη.

[5] ὑγιὴς κανὼν τοῦ σωτηρίου κηρύγματος.

were unconscious echoes of words in the epistles. The phrase in Hegesippus, *science falsely so called*, which could hardly have been accidental, came in our opinion from the pastoral epistles.

Lardner quotes two passages from Athenagoras, one referring to 1 Tim. v. 1, 2 ; the other to 1 Tim. vi. 16 ; but they are too distant to be relied on.[1]

Theophilus of Antioch writes : 'Moreover, concerning our being subject to principalities and powers, and praying for them, the divine word commands us to be thus subject to them, and to pray for them, that we may lead a quiet and peaceful life' (1 Tim. ii. 2 ; Titus iii. 1).[2] Here the resemblance is manifest.

After this, the testimonies become more explicit. Irenæus says : 'Whereas, some rejecting the truth, bring in lying words and vain genealogies, which minister questions, as the apostle says, rather than godly edifying which is in faith' (1 Tim. i. 4).[3]

Again : 'This Linus Paul has mentioned in the epistles to Timothy' (2 Tim. iv. 21).[4]

In another place he writes : 'As Paul says, "A man that is an heretic . . . reject" ' (Titus iii. 10).[5]

Clement of Alexandria quotes the epistles as Paul's. Thus he writes : 'Of which the apostle writing, says, "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings and oppositions of science," ' etc. (1 Tim. vi. 20).[6]

Again : 'In the second epistle to Timothy the noble

[1] *Works*, 4to. ed. vol. i. p. 380.

[2] *ἔτι μὲν καὶ περὶ τοῦ ὑποτάσσεσθαι ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις, καὶ εὔχεσθαι ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, κελεύει ἡμῖν (ἡμᾶς) θεῖος λόγος ὅπως ἥρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγωμεν.—Ad Autolyc.* iii. 14.

[3] *ἐπεί τὴν ἀλήθειαν παραπεμπόμενοί τινες, ἐπεισάγουσι λόγους ψευδεῖς καὶ γενεαλογίας ματαίας, αἵτινες ζητήσεις μᾶλλον παρέχουσι, καθὼς ὁ ἀπόστολός φησιν, ἡ οἰκοδομὴν Θεοῦ τὴν ἐν πίστει.—Contra Hæres.* i. procem.

[4] *τούτου τοῦ Λίνου Παῦλος ἐν ταῖς πρὸς Τιμόθεον ἐπιστολαῖς μέμνηται.—Ibid.* iii. 3, 3.

[5] *καὶ Παῦλος ἔφησεν· Αἱρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον . . . . παραιτοῦ.—Ibid.* iii. 3, 4.

[6] *περὶ ἧς ὁ ἀπόστολος γράφων, Ὦ Τιμόθεε, φησίν, τὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον, ἐκτρεπόμενος τὰς βεβήλους κενοφωνίας, κ.τ.λ.—Strom.* ii. p. 457, ed. Potter.

Paul commands,' etc.[1] Elsewhere he writes: 'Others speak of Epimenides, the Cretan . . . . . whom the apostle has mentioned in the epistle to Titus, speaking thus, "The Cretans are always liars"' (Titus i. 12).[2]

Tertullian's testimony is equally explicit: 'And this word Paul has used when writing to Timothy, "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust." And again: "That good thing which was committed to thee keep"' (1 Tim. vi. 20, and 2 Tim. i. 14).[3]

Again: 'But of this no more need be said, if it be the same Paul who, writing to the Galatians, reckons heresies among the works of the flesh, and who directs Titus to reject a man that is an heretic, after the first admonition, knowing that he who is such, is subverted and sinneth, being condemned of himself' (Titus iii. 10, 11).[4]

Justin Martyr often uses the expressions, *piety, godliness*,[5] the same Greek words as in the epistles. His 'Dialogue with Trypho' has also 'the kindness and love of God'[6] (Titus iii. 4).

The Testaments of the twelve patriarchs have: 'He is mediator of God and men,' etc. (1 Tim. ii. 5).[7]

These testimonies need not be followed farther. The epistles are in the old Syriac version and the Muratorian canon. Eusebius admitted them into the list of books generally received as divine.

[1] *ἐν τῇ ἑτέρᾳ πρὸς Τιμόθεον ἐπιστολῇ ὁ γενναῖος διατάσσεται Παῦλος.—Ibid.* iii. p. 536.

[2] *οἱ δὲ Ἐπιμενίδην τὸν Κρῆτα . . . . οὗ μέμνηται ὁ ἀπόστολος Παῦλος ἐν τῇ πρὸς Τίτον ἐπιστολῇ λέγων οὕτως, Κρῆτες ἀεὶ, κ.τ.λ.—Strom.* i. p. 350, ed. Potter.

[3] 'Et hoc verbo usus est Paulus ad Timotheum: "O Timothee, depositum custodi." Et rursus: "Bonum depositum serva."'—*De Præscript. Hæret.* c. 25.

[4] 'Nec diutius de isto, si idem et Paulus, qui et alibi hæreses inter carnalia crimina enumerat, scribens ad Galatas, et qui Tito suggerit, hominem hæreticum post primam correptionem recusandum, quod perversus sit ejusmodi et delinquat, ut a semetipso damnatus.'—*Ibid.* c. 6.

[5] *θεοσέβεια, εὐσέβεια.* [6] Chapter 47.

[7] *οὗτος ἐστιν μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων.—Dan.* 6.

The earliest external evidence against the epistles is that of Marcion, from whose canon they were absent. They were either non-existent in his time, or he rejected them. Internal evidence, as will be shown hereafter, leads us to believe that they existed earlier than Marcion (A.D. 140). He may have excluded them, as Tertullian leads us to suppose; though the verb[1] he applies to Marcion expresses nothing but an inference of his own. What Jerome says is borrowed from the Latin father; and the latter seems to have known nothing more of Marcion's procedure than that the alleged heretic counted up fewer Pauline epistles than those commonly assumed. Jerome's account of the relation between heretics and the pastoral epistles is indefinite and uncritical. He simply changes Tertullian's *recusaverit* into *repudiavit*. Eichhorn asserts that if Marcion had known the epistles, nothing in his system prevented him from using them. It is even alleged that he might have fitly employed them in support of his theological views.[2] The utmost we can concede is, that he might have admitted the epistle to Titus, as Tatian did afterwards, and expunged two passages in 2 Tim. ii. 8, 18, which must have been obnoxious; but not being so minutely discriminative, the three epistles were rejected together.

Other Gnostics, such as the Basilidians, agreed with Marcion in rejecting the epistles.

Tatian rejected the two to Timothy, but received that addressed to Titus. Perhaps he saw that the contents of the letter to Titus were less antignostic than those of the other two.

The letters were rejected by other heretics besides those just mentioned, as two incidental observations made by Jerome and Clement of Alexandria prove.[3]

[1] *Recusare.* 'Miror tamen cum ad unum hominem literas factas receperit, quod ad Timotheum duas, et unam ad Titum, de ecclesiastico statu compositas, recusaverit.'—*Adv. Marcion.* v. 21.

[2] *Einleit. ins N. T.* vol. iii. p. 383.

[3] *Præfat. Hieronymi in ep. ad Tit.*; Clementis *Strom.* ii. 11.

Some discarded the second to Timothy because of the passage about Jannes and Jambres.[1]

It must not be supposed that all the heretics of the second century rejected the epistles. In a treatise, commonly appended to the works of Clemens Alexandrinus, but written by a disciple of Theodotus, 1 Tim. ii. 5 is quoted. In another place, the expression, 'dwelling in light unapproachable' (1 Tim. vi. 16), is applied to the Son. We also learn from Tertullian,[2] that some false teachers, towards the close of the second century, appealed to passages (1 Tim. vi. 20 ; 2 Tim. i. 14), to support their claims to an esoteric and exoteric instruction in Christianity.

The early heretical opposition to the epistles seems to have been prompted by doctrinal prepossessions.

The result of our examination of the external evidence is, that the epistles were known prior to A.D. 150. There is a gap between A.D. 64 and 140 which we cannot fill up. From A.D. 70 till 130 there is no evidence respecting them. During that time they may have been written, and accepted as Paul's without opposition, not only because the age was uncritical, but because they were thought to be useful and edifying letters with a Pauline stamp.

The decision respecting their authenticity must turn upon internal evidence. What testimony do the epistles themselves give ?

1. The way in which Paul acts and speaks is adverse to his authorship of them.

Writers who personate another, generally throw in personal traits characteristic of him whose name they assume. This is exemplified by the author of the second epistle of Peter, who represents himself as a witness of the transfiguration scene. In like manner, we find in 1 Tim. i. 13, the author saying of himself, 'who was before a blasphemer and a persecutor and in-

[1] Origen *ad Matt.* xxvii. 9. [2] *De Præscript.* c. 25.

jurious;' and, in 1 Tim. i. 15, that he was the 'chief of sinners.' Such departure from simplicity resembles the rhetorical manner of Barnabas's fifth chapter, where the apostles are termed 'very great sinners,' to show the greatness of that grace which selected them as instruments. And as in 2 Peter i. 13, 14, Peter says of himself, that he must shortly put off his tabernacle as the Lord had showed him;[1] so we read in 2 Tim. iv. 6, 'the time of my departure is at hand.' Both are marks of spuriousness. The self-glorifying tone accompanying the certainty of a future event, 'I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day,' corroborates the belief that the writer tried to throw himself back into the apostle's feelings.

It is also remarkable, that Paul wrote both to Timothy and Titus, after having been with them shortly before, about things that he could have told them orally much better, and which he must have communicated to them if they were so important as they are represented. The author himself reminds Timothy that he had previously commanded him to do certain things. Why then does he repeat what had been already said by word of mouth? Is not this suspicious? The suspicion is increased when we read, 'these things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly' (1 Tim. iii. 14), and, 'Be diligent to come unto me' (Titus iii. 12). If the apostle was shortly to go to Timothy, and Titus to hasten back to him, why commit to writing instructions for their use in the short interval? In the second epistle to Timothy there is the same injunction, 'Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me' (iv. 9); 'Do thy diligence to come before winter' (iv. 21); so that this characteristic trait of the epistles arises from a desire to prevent Timothy from being considered too

[1] John xxi. 18, 19.

independent of the apostle. The epistolary instructions imply that Timothy and Titus had been located in certain places to perform duties requiring time and wisdom. Why then should they be immediately withdrawn from their spheres of labour? Do not the epistles provide for a lengthened term of office at Ephesus and Crete?

The repeated assurances which Paul gives to his friends, Timothy and Titus, that he was entrusted with the gospel, of which he was the herald, teacher and apostle (1 Tim. ii. 7), coupled with the solemn affirmation taken from the epistle to the Romans, 'I speak the truth in Christ, I lie not,' show one who is merely personating the apostle; for those fellow-labourers needed nothing to convince them that Paul was not an impostor. Such anxiety to confirm the authority of the writer betrays his own position. Paul's apostolic commission required no justification before friends who had been intimately associated with him for years.

2. The manner in which Timothy and Titus are described excites grave suspicions of Pauline authorship. The former is reminded of his early instruction (2 Tim. iii. 15), and of his mother and grandmother, in relation to which subject the writer has the strange clause, 'from my forefathers.' The evangelist is enjoined 'to flee youthful lusts.' How do these statements suit a companion of the apostle, whose ripe years and experience were well known? On the supposition of a second captivity, Timothy must have attended the apostle for thirteen years, a fact which does not agree well with 'let no man despise thy youth.' He surely did not need to be told, nor is it at all likely that the apostle would have written to him, 'Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities.' 'Thou, O man of God, flee these things, and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness.' 'Refuse profane and old wives' fables, and

exercise thyself rather unto godliness. For bodily exercise profiteth little, but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come. This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation.' 'Be thou an example of the believers in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity. Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine. Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them; that thy profiting may appear to all. Take heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine; continue in them,' etc. etc. 'Wherefore I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands.' 'Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me his prisoner.' 'Consider what I say; and *the Lord give thee understanding in all things.*' 'Remember that Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, was raised from the dead, according to my gospel.' 'Watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry.' He is here treated like a catechumen and novice. One of the passages implies that he did not rightly understand the apostle's doctrine (2 Tim. ii. 7). The portrait of Timothy is an artificial one, the writer addressing him in the style of a schoolmaster, not of a well-tried friend.

With respect to Titus, the case is not very different, for many instructions are unsuited to one in his position. 'Speak thou the things which become sound doctrine. That the aged men be sober, grave, temperate, sound in faith, in charity, in patience. The aged women likewise, that they be in behaviour as becometh holiness, not false accusers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things; that they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their

children, to be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed. Young men likewise exhort to be sober-minded. In all things showing thyself a pattern of good works: in doctrine showing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity, sound speech, that cannot be condemned; that he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed, having no evil thing to say of you. Exhort servants to be obedient unto their own masters, and to please them well in all things: not answering again; not purloining, but showing all good fidelity; that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things' (Titus ii. 1–10). 'Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work, to speak evil of no man, to be no brawlers but gentle, showing all meekness unto all men' (iii. 1, 2).

According to the epistle Titus was entrusted with the oversight of the church in Crete, not as permanent bishop, which a later tradition makes him, but as Paul's temporary representative. Why he should have been selected for a post so arduous can only be conjectured. Perhaps, as he was formerly the occasion of deciding the question of circumcision, the author of the epistle chooses him against the 'vain talkers and deceivers, especially they of the circumcision' (i. 10).

3. The general tone and character of the epistles are different from Paul's.

It is difficult to describe what we mean without going into particulars; but the critical reader will have no difficulty in apprehending it. The precepts and directions are ethical, relating to conduct and matters of convenience or propriety. The very health of Timothy is attended to. Regulations about churches, their organisation and their office-bearers, are such as might have been left to the judgment of Timothy and Titus themselves. Good works are much more prominent

than the central doctrines which the apostle insisted upon. And the precepts are so vague as to have no proper adaptation to the circumstances. Every one perceives a practical tendency in the letters which is wholesome enough but too common-place to proceed from Paul, because it is neither based on high motives, nor on the Pauline faith in Christ. The tone of the epistles savours of one who does not act under an abiding impression of Christ crucified, but takes an ethical view of Christianity. The pervading spirit is sober and sensible, without vigour, point, depth or spiritual richness. One object of writing to Timothy and Titus was to instruct them respecting the right organisation and management of the churches in Ephesus and Crete. Accordingly the qualifications of bishops, deacons, deaconesses, etc., are enumerated (1 Tim. iii.; Titus i. 6, etc.), qualifications common-place enough, descending even to the mention of a bishop not being a drunkard or striker. Surely the two evangelists must have known of themselves all that is said here. We cannot suppose that Paul would have written on the subject in that fashion. His directions and counsels would have been more profound and valuable, stating general principles, instead of numerous details. Nothing is said about the spiritual qualifications of a bishop, what subjects he should chiefly speak of, how he should preach, or how hearers and preachers should stand towards each other. The highest duties are omitted.

As the Paulinism of these epistles is predominantly practical, faith is no longer their central principle. It has lost its importance by being constantly put with love and other virtues (1 Tim. i. 5, 14; ii. 15; iv. 12; vi. 11; 2 Tim. i. 13; ii. 22; Titus ii. 2). Hence all the more stress is laid upon godliness or works, which are largely insisted on, so much so that by doing them one is said to lay a good foundation for the life to

come (1 Tim. vi. 19). Right action is emphasised much more than in Paul's epistles. Women should adorn themselves with good works. A widow chosen to an ecclesiastical office should be well reported of for good works. She should have diligently followed every good work. Rich men should be charged to do good and to be rich in good works. The Christian is a vessel prepared unto every good work. The man of God is thoroughly furnished unto all good works. Some are reprobate unto every good work. Titus should show himself a pattern of good works. Jesus Christ purposed to purify unto himself a people zealous of good works. Titus is exhorted to remind the Cretans to be ready to every good work. He is also to affirm certain things constantly, that believers might be careful to maintain good works. In these passages the substance of Christianity consists of good works. Instead of *faith* having the specific importance which Paul gives it, the general idea of *piety*, a frequent expression in these epistles, is put in its place. Thus Paulinism is flattened into ethical precepts, losing its incisive power and prominence. The word *faith* has commonly an objective meaning, viz. a system of theoretical convictions or the dogmas of a creed. We do not say that Paulinism is absent from the epistles, for it is stated that we are saved not according to our works of righteousness but according to the divine mercy (Titus iii. 5 ; 2 Tim. i. 9). But it takes another shape, being filed off into practical precepts ; while faith, its cardinal principle, is dethroned.

The vague generality which characterises the epistles is observable in the exhortations about public prayers (1 Tim. ii.), about the adorning of women, about slaves (vi. 1, etc.), and the rich (vi. 17–19). The writer affirms that Christ is able to keep *what has been committed* to him against the day of appearing ; he exhorts Timothy to hold fast the form of sound words which he had heard of Paul, and to keep that good thing which

was committed to him. He diverges into commonplaces, as in 2 Tim. ii. 20, 21; iii. 12; iv. 17. No leading object is pursued throughout. The author speaks of himself, of Timothy, of false teachers, passing from the one to the other abruptly, or starting off into statements of a general character, and coming back to an abandoned topic without proper preparation for it.

4. Un-pauline sentiments occur.

'I obtained mercy *because* I did it ignorantly in unbelief' (1 Tim. i. 13). The apostle's ignorance and want of belief were the reason why God showed him compassion. That his guilt was less because of his ignorance is undeniable; but that he obtained mercy *on account of* ignorance and unbelief, is an anti-pauline idea. 'Notwithstanding she shall be saved in child-bearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety' (1 Tim. ii. 15). Here it is stated that women shall be saved by bearing children, if they continue in faith, etc. One condition of their salvation is the bearing of children. The word translated *child-bearing* may indeed embrace the motherly duties of a wife and presuppose the performance of them in a Christian spirit. But this does not exclude the idea of merit. The passage plainly asserts that the duties of a mother are the way to obtain an eternal reward. Seeing that women were debarred from teaching in the church, the writer finds for them an equivalent privilege. In the first epistle to the Corinthians, Paul recommends celibacy, perhaps under the peculiar circumstances of the times. But in the 14th chapter, where he prohibits females from taking part in the religious services of assemblies, he gives no compensation for the forbidden privilege, and no consolatory promise instead of it. The passage before us expresses an old Jewish idea, and clashes with the seventh chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians.

'One of themselves, even a prophet of their own,

said, The Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies. *This witness is true*,' etc. (Titus i. 12, 13). Here the writer pronounces a harsh judgment on the Cretans generally, though he had shortly before spread the truth and founded churches among them. The ready acceptance which Paul had in Crete, makes the severe statement improbable. He always expressed as favourable an opinion as possible respecting those to whom he had preached.

After the writer of the first epistle to Timothy speaks of persons who wished to be teachers of the law but understood nothing of its nature, he proceeds to describe the legitimate use which an instructor might make of it, viz. that it should be urged upon those who still continue in sin, to awaken them to repentance; adding immediately, that what he had just said about the law being for the ungodly not the righteous, is consistent with the gospel of the glory of the blessed God (i. 7–11). This is not Paul's method of meeting persons who insisted on the obligation of the law, but is a conciliatory and mediating position between the friends of the law and Pauline Christians. The apostle himself would have said that we are justified by faith not by the law.

In 1 Timothy iv. 1, the writer speaks of 'doctrines of devils or demons,' i.e. doctrines proceeding from demons. False doctrine was supposed to come from the devil or demons as his instruments, which is an un-Pauline sentiment.[1] The apostle had to contend with many erroneous doctrines; but he never characterised them as the invention of demons.

In Titus i. 2, iii. 7, *hope* is connected with eternal life. This is also un-Pauline. The apostle never joins hope to eternal life.

In Titus iii. 5, the connecting of baptism with the new birth is foreign to Paul. To make it Pauline,

[1] Compare Tertullian. 'Hæ sunt doctrinæ hominum et dæmoniorum,' etc.—*De Præscript. Hæret.* c. 7.

many interpreters resort to another sense of the word *washing*. The sacramental efficacy ascribed to baptism goes beyond Paul's teaching on the subject. There is an approach to it in Romans vi. 3–4 and Galat. iii. 27; but the difference in distinct assertion is apparent. Instead of regeneration being a process as it is in Paul, it is an act coincident with baptism. God effects regeneration by the baptismal bath.

Here, as in other cases, there is an agreement with Johannine ideas; for the fourth gospel also teaches that the Holy Spirit is communicated and man regenerated in baptism (John iii. 5, etc.). Developed Paulinism often tended towards ideas expressed in the fourth gospel.

In 2 Tim. i. 10, the idea that Christ abolished death and brought life and immortality to light *by the gospel*, is un-Pauline. That he gave life to the world by revealing the higher life which was in himself, savours of the fourth gospel; so that the statement even without the addition 'by the gospel' is scarcely Pauline.

In the first epistle to Timothy there are two doxologies which cannot but strike the reader as un-Pauline. It is not the apostle's manner to accumulate predicates of God as they are in these instances: 'Now to the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only God, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen.' 'The blessed and only potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen nor can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen.' These predicates are intended to set forth the absolute essence of God and resemble Gnostic ideas, some of them pretty closely, such as, 'inhabiting unapproachable light.' Gnostic attacks on the anthropomorphism of the Old Testament led the orthodox to avoid everything sensuous in relation to God, and to describe his abstract being. In doing so, they

appropriated predicates which the Gnostics used, to rebut their opposition the more effectually. There is little doubt that the epithet *King of the ages* was a Gnostic phrase.[1] Coming from Paul, such doxological epithets would be idle. Besides, he never uses 'the only God,' 'the only potentate,' 'the blessed potentate;' neither has he 'the blessed God' (1 Tim. i. 11), or 'the great God' (Titus ii. 13).

In 1 Tim. vi. 14–15, it is said, that 'the appearing' or second coming of our Lord Jesus Christ will be *shown* in his times *by God the Father*, which is un-Pauline; since the apostle speaks of his appearing as an independent act. Here it is subordinated to the power and will of God.

The phrase 'the last days' is post-Pauline (2 Tim. iii. 1). Similar ones occur in James, Jude, 1 Peter, 2 Peter, and Ignatius's epistle to the Ephesians; all foreign to the apostle himself.

The word *heretic* (Titus iii. 10) is not used by Paul but is of later origin. It means a person attached to or causing heresy. Formed as it is from a Greek word[2] which the apostle never applies to doctrine but always to a *faction* or *party*, the prominent idea in *heretic* is here a doctrinal aberration.

In 2 Tim. iii. 16, we read that every writing (of the holy Scriptures) is inspired by God, and useful for doctrine, for reproof, etc.

Here the old Testament in all its parts is expressly raised to a high value, immediately after it is declared the basis of Christian piety ('able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus'). The importance attached to the single books of the Old Testament as well as to the whole collection, is not a Pauline idea. It may be conceded that Paul believed

[1] The same phrase occurs in Tobit xiii. 6, and in 1 Clement lxi. 2. There are also cognate expressions in 1 Clement lv. 6, xxxv. 3.

[2] αἵρεσις.

in the verbal inspiration of the Old Testament, since he appears to countenance that notion (Gal. iii. 16); but that he would assert every portion of the collection to be 'inspired of God' is improbable. A reason may be found for the stress laid upon the Old Testament. As the Gnostics undervalued it, mainly on a Pauline basis, the writer gives an emphatic testimony in its favour, asserting not only the inspiration but the practical use of every part belonging to the volume.

5. The letters exhibit many proofs of a post-apostolic origin. An example is furnished by the ecclesiastical widows or female presbyters referred to in 1 Tim. v. 9–16, where it is prescribed that a widow, to be eligible for church duties should be sixty, and should have had but one husband. The author proceeds to exclude all widows under sixty, recommending the younger ones to marry again and bear children. We cannot agree with Baur, who gives a wider meaning to the word *widow*, viz. that of marriageable persons, not merely widows but virgins; though the sense of the passage is improved, and the incongruity between the ninth and the eleventh and fourteenth verses removed by that expedient.[1] In proof of such ecclesiastical meaning which the term *widow* bore in the second century, a passage in Ignatius is quoted.[2] But the text of the passage is uncertain. If the word had an extended meaning in the second century, there is no necessity to apply it here. The institute of ecclesiastical widows belonged to that century, as we learn from Tertullian; and the probability is, that it was not so early as the first, since a formal selection is indicated here. Deaconesses were not unknown to the apostolic time, as Phebe was one in the church at Cenchrea; these female presbyters or ecclesiastical widows were probably post-apostolic.

[1] *Paulus der Apostel, u.s.w.*, p. 497.
[2] *Ep. ad Smyrn.* c. 13.

The injunction respecting a bishop or elder, that he should be the husband of one wife only (Titus i. 6; 1 Tim. iii. 2), also savours of a time when second marriages of ecclesiastics were in disrepute. The dislike to them arose out of an ascetic spirit, early in the second century. The apostle Paul, notwithstanding his preference for the unmarried state, was not the man to abridge Christian liberty by a precept like the present.

The letters speak of elders, the bishop, and deacons. Elders and deacons were in the apostolic churches. And in the lifetime of the apostle, elders were identical with bishops, as appears from Acts xx. 28; Phil. i. 1. In the epistle to Titus, we read that he was left in Crete to ordain *elders* in every city; and it is added, 'for a *bishop* must be blameless,' etc.; elders in the plural, bishop in the singular. Does not this intimate a distinction between them? Does it not imply a college of elders, with one of their number for president or *primus inter pares*? Does it not point to a period when the title *bishop* was claimed by the presiding elder?

After the apostolic age, the monarchical principle began to develop. The presiding elder gained increasing influence. He began to be ambitious, and set himself up above his brethren. The manifestation of such power is indicated by the singular number *bishop* in the first epistle to Timothy and that to Titus. The writer gives copious instructions respecting office-bearers. The teachers were to be men holding the faithful words transmitted by apostles, which they had to hand over to others. Wholesome doctrine must be within the Church; the presiding officers having charge of the treasure. Greater stress is laid upon office than is done in Paul's epistles, because right-minded teachers were needful against serious errors. The hierarchical principle grew as the idea of unity pressed itself upon the mind. Though it appears here in germ, Paul could scarcely give the first impulse to institutions which reflect

the spirit of Judaism and bear the forms of the catholic Church. The tendency to a centralised, gradationed constitution is foreign to the character of Pauline Christianity. Is it not evident, that a post-apostolic time, in which the process of amalgamation between Paulines and Petrines had considerably advanced, throws back its own organism, making Paul the originator of ecclesiastical relations which were not fully developed till the third and fourth centuries ?

This argument would be weakened if the assertions of some theologians about the episcopal office were correct. But the institution of that office cannot be assigned to the first century or to John. Notwithstanding the strong statement, 'at the very commencement of the second century it is an acknowledged fact that the *episcopal* office was firmly and widely established,'[1] and the prolix considerations adduced by Bishop Lightfoot which lead up to his conclusion, 'an episcopate can be traced as far back as the closing years of the first century, and cannot without violence to historical testimony be dissevered from the name of St. John,'[2] the argument breaks down for want of proof. Rothe was refuted by Baur and Ritschl; while the links of Lightfoot's chain are weak indeed. Clement of Alexandria shows that John at Ephesus looked upon bishops and presbyters as the same.[3] Clement of Rome, speaking of bishops and deacons, implies that the former were identical with presbyters.[4] The case of James, as bishop of Jerusalem, was unique; and was subsequently copied in the Alexandrian church.[5] In Gentile churches episcopacy was developed out of presbytery; and the

[1] *A New Testament Commentary for English Readers*, by various writers, vol. iii. p. 175.

[2] *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, p. 232.

[3] *Quis dives salv.* 42.

[4] *Ep. ad Corinth.* xlii. 4.

[5] See Ritschl's *Entstehung der Altkatholischen Kirche*, p. 415, etc., 2nd edition.

distinction between one bishop and several presbyters appears first in the Ignatian epistles. The new constitution was not 'firmly and widely established' till the third century. Irenæus himself uses the names *bishops* and *presbyters* as synonymous; and Tertullian includes both under the common word *seniores*. With Clement of Alexandria, the distinction between presbyter and bishop is merely relative. Proof of the extreme antiquity of the pastoral epistles from the absence of a supposed episcopal institution misses the mark.

Repeated allusions occur to *sound doctrine*, *the faithful word*, *a faithful saying*, *sound words*, *words of faith and good doctrine*, *wholesome words*, received by Timothy from the apostle, and which he is enjoined to keep with all purity. The writer does not explain what he means by the sacred treasure; but supposes that Timothy and Titus knew it well. What gave rise to these injunctions? Erroneous doctrine. The false teachers combated had departed from *the faith*. They had erred concerning *the truth*. There was a doctrinal creed, deviation from which was considered heresy. The word faith is not used in a subjective but objective sense denoting a creed, and therefore *the common faith* is referred to (Titus i. 4). A system of theoretical opinions had been formed, variously termed *sound* or *good doctrine*, or simply *the doctrine* (1 Tim. vi. 1), which was a touchstone to try errors. The antagonism of orthodoxy and heterodoxy had already begun.

Faith having thus become dogma, a community bound together by a doctrinal tie naturally follows. Accordingly the idea of *the Church* finds expression in the epistles. The consciousness of ecclesiastical unity appears. A growing importance is attached to organisation. The bishop, elders, deacons, deaconesses, ecclesiasiastical widows are described, with their qualifications. The consolidation of the Church is important in the eyes of the writer; whereas Paul thought little

of ecclesiastical arrangements in his zeal for higher subjects. The fact points to a time when concentration began to be thought of by the Christians who had been taught by apostles or their disciples ; when the idea of one catholic Church took possession of the mind, as a bulwark against the dangers that threatened to destroy Christian union. It was necessary to build up a Church having bishops who should transmit the true doctrine to others, and guard it against Gnostic errors. Hence the Church is termed the pillar and ground of truth in 1 Tim. iii. 15, an un-Pauline idea ; for in the first epistle to the Corinthians Jesus Christ is said to be the foundation, not the Church.[1] This Church as the firm foundation of God (2 Tim. ii. 19) has a twofold inscription, as pillars and foundation-stones commonly have ; one, 'The Lord knows them that are his,' i.e. none can belong to it who is not chosen by Christ ; the other, 'Let every Christian depart from iniquity,' to which false doctrine necessarily leads. But though the Church forms an inclosure, it is not so select or separate from the world as to exclude distinctions of members belonging to it, or even false teachers. There are in it a variety of vessels, honourable and dishonourable. If a man purge himself from vessels of dishonour, from false teachers and their errors, he becomes a vessel of honour. This is a mild view of errorists, not that hatred of heretics which the Church showed at a later period. Such as oppose themselves are to be instructed with meekness, if perchance God may give them repentance to the acknowledgment of the truth. A heretic is not to be rejected till he has disregarded repeated admonitions, and then he is self-condemned. All directions respecting the arrangements of the Church as well as those about heretics, tend to realise unity; enforcing the principle that the basis of the Church is one faith.

[1] It is wrong to apply the words 'pillar and ground of truth' to Timothy, as Canon Farrar does.

6. The universality of God's favour has a prominence in these epistles which it has not in Paul's. 'This is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all' (1 Tim. ii. 3–6). 'The living God, who is the Saviour of all men' (1 Tim. iv. 10). 'The grace of God that bringeth salvation, hath appeared to all men' (Titus ii. 11). These emphatic statements imply the existence of an opposite sentiment, viz. that the grace of God was not intended for all, one entertained by the Gnostics, who, making a distinction between different classes, believed that those only should be received into the kingdom of light who had in them the pneumatic principle. All not belonging to the class of the pneumatics were excluded from happiness. Such Gnostic particularism is glanced at in the expression, 'to come to the full knowledge of the truth;'[1] for 'knowledge'[2] was with the Gnostics the only condition of happiness. 'Coming to the full knowledge of the truth' is synonymous with or included in the phrase 'to be saved.'

7. Numerous passages in the epistles show the use of Paul's acknowledged writings, not merely in idea but expression. Examples are: 1 Tim. ii. 11, 12, comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35; 2 Tim. i. 3, comp. Rom. i. 9; 2 Tim. ii. 5, comp. 1 Cor. ix. 24; 2 Tim. ii. 6, comp. 1 Cor. ix. 7, 10; 2 Tim. ii. 8, comp. Rom. i. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 11, comp. Rom. vi. 8; 2 Tim. ii. 20, comp. Rom. ix. 21; 2 Tim. iii. 2, etc., Rom. i. 29, etc.; 2 Tim. iv. 6, Phil. ii. 17, 23. This similarity is seldom denied, but it has been attributed to one and the same writer, especially as it is accompanied by divergence. Yet another and inferior colouring belongs to it, which savours of an imitator. Thus, in 2 Tim. ii. 8, there is a harsh ellipsis which is

[1] ἐλθεῖν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας. [2] γνῶσις.

supplied in Rom. i, 3.[1] When the adjective found in the latter passage was omitted, the writer should have at least retained the article.[2] The construction is deficient.

The same abridging process appears in 2 Tim. iv. 6, compared with its original in Phil. ii. 17. The word 'I am poured out as a libation or drink-offering,' is obscure without some such addition as it has in the Philippian passage. In 2 Tim. i. 3, the Greek phraseology is inferior to that of the original (Rom. i. 9).

The present epistles show the use of other writings besides the Pauline. Thus the word *mediator* is taken from the epistle to the Hebrews (compare 1 Tim. ii. 5 with Hebr. viii. 6 ; ix. 15 ; xii. 2), a word which the apostle Paul never applies to Christ ; for Moses is meant in Gal. iii. 20. As Schleiermacher has remarked, the term involves the idea of a covenant, without which idea in the context, the use of it is abrupt. Preparation should be made for it by the word *covenant*, or by some direct expression of what a covenant means.

8. In 1 Tim. v. 18, we read : 'For the Scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And, The labourer is worthy of his hire.' The first part of the quotation is from Deut. xxv. 4. The second part is not from the Old Testament, but from Luke x. 7. Hence Luke's gospel which preceded the present epistle was not written till the second century. The priority of that gospel as well as Mark's is also favoured by the antagonism to riches in 1 Tim. vi. 9, 10, 17–19, for Essene ideas on the subject are expressed in those gospels (Luke vi. 24, etc., xvi. 19, etc., Mark x. 23, 24).

9. The passage 1 Tim. iii. 16 : 'And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness, *who* was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the

[1] τοῦ γενομένου. [2] τὸν ἐκ σπέρματος.

world, received up into glory,' is introduced abruptly. No subject to the relative pronoun *who* is mentioned; and the propositions are arranged in corresponding pairs. The meaning of the whole passage and of its separate clauses is obscure. It is probable that it was taken from some early hymn. As the writer does not state the subject, there is a christological gap where something definite about the person of Christ is expected. In 1 Tim. ii. 5 the *humanity* of Christ Jesus is emphatically stated; and the assertion 'was manifested in the flesh,' does not suit a mere man, but can only refer to a superhuman being. Hence the subject of the mystery of godliness—of that Christian godliness long hidden from the world but at length revealed, is the Word. The terminology is nearer that of the Johannine writings than the Pauline; and the *personal* subject of the manifestation is un-Pauline.

'The good confession' (1 Tim. vi. 12, 13) which Timothy made before many witnesses also points to a post-apostolic period; public and solemn confessions of faith being unknown in Paul's day. If the words 'and Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession,' were not in a creed like that of the apostles' when the pastoral letters were written, they bear the same sense as they do in that creed. Christ 'before Pontius Pilate *witnessed* a good confession,' i.e. he was the first martyr. The allusion is not to John xviii. 35, etc., where he declared himself to be King of truth or the Messiah, but to his sufferings and death.

10. According to Holtzmann, the number of words occurring in these epistles, and nowhere else in the New Testament, is 171. Compounds are frequent, especially such as have alpha privative prefixed. There are 133 words unknown to Paul's authentic epistles.[1]

Characteristic words and expressions are εὐσέβεια *piety*, which occurs several times in the second epistle

[1] See Holtzmann's *Die Pastoralbriefe*, p. 86, etc.

of Peter, a post-apostolic production, and only once besides in Acts iii. 12. The cognate verb εὐσεβεῖν is also found in Acts, besides 1 Tim. v. 4; while εὐσεβῶς is only in the pastoral epistles. All are later words, as is also the adjective εὐσεβής, which is in the Acts and 2 Peter. πιστὸς ὁ λόγος, a phrase without a parallel in Paul's writings; ὑγιής and ὑγιαίνειν applied to correct doctrine; μύθοι *fables* only in 2 Peter besides, which shows that it is a late term; ζητήσεις *disputed questions*; ἐπιφάνεια *the appearing* or second advent, for παρουσία; δεσπότης instead of Paul's κύριος *master*; σώφρων and its derivatives; γάγγραινα and νοσεῖν the opposite of *sound doctrine*; σωτήρ *Saviour* applied to God; ἀρνεῖσθαι, never used by Paul, though it occurs in the epistles to the Hebrews, 2 Peter, 1 John and Jude; παραιτεῖσθαι *to reject*, not used by Paul but by Luke and the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews; περιϊστάναι *to avoid*, never used by Paul; προσέχειν with the dative, never used by Paul but by Luke, and the authors of the epistle to the Hebrews and 2 Peter; ὑπομιμνήσκειν *to put in mind*, occurring in 2 Peter, 3 John and Jude, but not in Paul's epistles; ἐκτρέπεσθαι *to be turned away*, only once in the epistle to the Hebrews besides; βέβηλος *profane*, only used in Hebr. xii. 16 besides; διαβεβαιοῦσθαι περί τινος *to affirm of a thing*; ἀνόσιος *unholy*; γενεαλογίαι *genealogies*; ματαιολογία, ματαιολόγος *vain talk, a vain talker*; λογομαχίαι *disputes of words*; λογομαχεῖν *to dispute about words*; κενοφωνίαι *vain babblings*; παραθήκη *a deposit*; ἀστοχεῖν *to swerve from*; τυφοῦσθαι *to be lifted up*. A considerable number of words are employed here and only in Hebrews, Acts, 2 Peter, or Luke's gospel besides. The writer of the third gospel and the Acts has many terms identical with those in the epistles before us; and this is but natural, as he was a Pauline Christian of the second century. It is easy to point out the phraseology which Paul would have used instead of that occurring in the epistles. For

epiphany, applied to Christ's second coming, the apostle has *parousia*. The former may have been a favourite Gnostic expression, as Baur thinks. In like manner the apostolic *for the destruction*[1] gives place to *the subverting*,[2] and τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦτον to τὸν νῦν αἰῶνα. Paul never says *a servant of God* (Titus i. 1), but *of Jesus Christ*.

The argument founded upon words or phrases in these epistles is often neutralised by alleging the analogy of peculiar expressions in the Pauline epistles. In that to the Galatians fifty-seven occur, in that to the Philippians fifty-four, and in the epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians together 143. This is a mechanical objection that will not stand examination. Many of the expressions peculiar to the epistles before us do not arise from the necessity of having representatives of new ideas or new ways of uttering old thoughts, but from another and later cast of thought unlike Paul's at any period of his known life; from an ecclesiastical atmosphere foreign to apostolic times, or from the idiosyncrasy of a writer who did not possess the mental opulence which is satisfied with fewer compound terms. The quality as well as the quantity of words should be considered. If it be, no proper analogy can annul the force of the argument. A Gnostic terminology is discernible, such as 'æonian times' (2 Tim. i. 9; Titus i. 2); 'myths and genealogies;' perhaps also 'epiphany.'

11. The association of ideas is loose. The construction is not dominated by deep thought struggling for utterance, but has an incompact form. A variety of general terms indicative of worthlessness is employed in the concrete description of false teachers--unlike the method of Paul, who seldom uses indefinite words or speaks in common-places of his opponents. We feel that the writer does not draw his convictions from deep-seated

[1] πρὸς καθαίρεσιν, 2 Cor. x. 4. [2] ἐπὶ καταστροφῇ, 2 Tim. ii. 14.

consciousness of divine things, but is superficial and vague compared with the apostle.

We admit that the language of the apostle may have changed. His spirit was not stereotyped; and the development of new ideas created new expressions. The distinctive diction of the epistles is not explained by the principle of personal development, because the earliest and latest Pauline writings are not so unlike in phraseology as are the pastoral epistles to all that the apostle himself wrote. The argument for non-authenticity based upon diction and style is a valid one.

Other considerations are advanced to account for the change, such as difference of design leading to the discussion of different topics, difference of the parties addressed, of the relations sustained by the writer to those parties, and the general circumstances affecting both at the time of writing. But all this applies to the authentic epistles, which yet retain their substantial identity of language. The difference between letters to churches and to private individuals has been frequently adduced as an explanation. The tone of private and public epistles is certainly different. But these letters present phenomena as striking as those in epistles to churches. The fact of the writer repeating what was said to churches, neutralises the alleged explanation. And is the difference of persons addressed sufficient to account for a different structure of periods? When it is suggested, that it is natural for an instructor writing to his pupils to make compendious references to truths well known; to urge, repeat, expand, what has been the spiritual food of his life; to rest on former conclusions and state great facts in concentrated antithesis, the reply is easy. The writer does not urge, repeat, and expand the doctrine of justification by faith in opposition to works. He relies indeed on *sound doctrine*, and falls back upon *the faith* or *wholesome words*;

but as he was writing to pupils placed in novel circumstances because they had to deal with serious errors in doctrine, it would have been natural to point out the best method of meeting and refuting such errors. Instead of laying down some general principles for the guidance of Timothy and Titus in settling the churches and preventing the spread of dangerous sentiments within them, the writer is contented with vague assertions about remembering and holding fast the form of sound words. He opposes an orthodox creed to heresy, without explaining what the creed is. The letters are practical not doctrinal; though a leading object in writing them was to oppose false doctrine. If it be said that Timothy and Titus did not need doctrinal instruction, we reply that they had less need of such exhortations relating to their own conduct as, 'Drink no longer water, but use a little wine.' 'Keep thyself pure.' 'Take heed unto thyself.' 'In all things showing thyself a pattern of good works.' 'Let no man despise thee.'

Should it be said that the pastoral epistles were autographic, while the others (except those to the Galatians and Philemon) were dictated, and the apostle's difficulty in writing himself led to greater conciseness and abruptness of style, the explanation is unfortunate, because the language of these epistles is generally superior to Paul's in clearness. The assumption of autography favours the spuriousness of the letters.

The change of style is too great to comport with identity of authorship. Imitations of phrases and terms occurring in Paul's authentic epistles are obvious; inferiority and feebleness show dependence; while the new constructions and words betray a writer treating of new circumstances and giving expression to new ideas, yet all the while personating the apostle. The alteration is palpable; though the author throws himself back into the situation of Paul the prisoner.

Canon Farrar's 'flashes of the deepest feeling, outbursts of the most intense expression,' attributed to the epistles, are simply non-existent.

Some weight attaches to the argument that brings up want of logical connection in these epistles, digression, departure from the leading object, and imperfect transitions from one thing to another. There are abrupt transitions, as at 2 Tim. ii. 14 ; Titus iii. 8 ; awkward beginnings of sentences, 1 Tim. iii. 16 ; want of logical connection, though the inferential particle *therefore* is employed (1 Tim. ii. 1) ; incorrect connection of ideas (1 Tim. vi. 10) ; *love of money, which some coveting* ;[1] phrases obscurely vague, as 'the commandment' in 1 Tim. vi. 14 ; and the awkward construction in 2 Tim. iv. 1, where the verb has no proper object, '*I testify* before God and the Lord Jesus Christ who shall judge the quick and the dead, and *call to witness* his appearing and his kingdom ;' the same verb being supplied in a somewhat different sense.

Though enfeebled by a life of suffering, the apostle could hardly have written in a way so inferior to that of his former self ; and the construction, style, vigour and fitness of expression cannot be considered authentic without disparagement to his intellect.

12. Attempts to identify the false teachers of the epistles with a single system have been unsuccessful. Some passages point to one class of opinions ; others to another. According to Mangold,[2] the errorists were Essene Ebionites. This hypothesis is favoured by various phenomena, such as 1 Tim. i. 4–11, where 'teachers of the law' seem to be associated with 'myths and endless genealogies ;' by the 'genealogies and contentions and strivings about the law' of Titus iii. 9 ; and by the 'Jewish myths and commandments of men' of

[1] φιλαργυρία ἧς ὀρεγόμενοι.

[2] *Die Irrlehrer der Pastoralbriefe*, p. 2, etc., and in Bleek's *Einleit.* p. 577, third edition.

Titus i. 14. Other particulars in the same direction are the abstinence from meats, and celibacy in 1 Tim. iv. 3. Perhaps the phrase 'especially they of the circumcision' may indicate the same party, though Otto thinks it shows a consciousnses on the part of the writer that he had no one system in view.[1] But the prohibition of marriage goes far beyond the practice of the Essenes, who merely *preferred* the unmarried state. Nor could it be well said of them that they denied the power of godliness along with the maintenance of its form (2 Tim. iii. 5).

On the other hand, the epistles contain anti-marcionite statements, such as the *antitheses of gnosis* (1 Tim. vi. 20), apparently pointing to the title of Marcion's work in which the law and the gospel were set in opposition; as also the spiritual view of the resurrection (2 Tim. ii. 18). That women are saved by childbearing and young widows commanded to marry again (1 Tim. ii. 15, v. 10–14), are statements seemingly directed against Marcionism. Yet this Baurian hypothesis disagrees with the assertion that the opponents gave heed to 'Jewish myths and the commandments of men' (Titus i. 14); and with their being 'teachers of the law' (1 Tim. i. 7). The antinomianism of the famous heretic is scarcely noticed in the epistles. In making his hypothesis partly include the Valentinians and Ophites, whose myths and endless genealogies suit various allusions, Baur makes it more plausible. And the *antitheses* of Marcion may be a title borrowed from the first epistle to Timothy, where it means the propositions of a false gnosis antagonistic to orthodoxy.

Ophitism is also supposed to be the system opposed in our epistles; and this is a more plausible hypothesis than either of the preceding. But the considerations

[1] *Die geschichtlichen Verhältnisse der Pastoralbrief.* p. 132, etc.

adduced for it by Schenkel[1] are not convincing; while it is contradicted by such statements as the prohibition of marriage in 1 Tim. iv. 3, which applies to the followers of Saturninus not to the Ophites as we learn from Irenæus.

The statements in our epistles cannot be restricted to one heretical party, because the colours are general and the traits common to varieties of Gnosticism. There are, for example, both anti-dualistic and anti-docetic references (1 Tim. iv. 3, 4, iii. 16), with emphatic assertions that annihilate separation between the God of the Old Testament and the God of the New (1 Tim. vi. 15, 16). Emphasising of the Mediator's humanity in 1 Tim. ii. 5, is directed against docetism; and he is called *one* in opposition to the division of his person into two, a heavenly and an earthly Christ. Theosophic speculation burrowing in the mind and entangling it in the meshes of idle disputations was at the root of the tenets which marred the unity of Christians and called forth an attempt to counteract them by an ecclesiastical organisation uniting believers, and an accompanying confession of faith. The writer throws in his anti-gnostic colours at random; a fact well exemplified in 1 Tim. i. 3–11.

The view now taken has its analogy in the Ignatian epistles, which exhibit features antagonistic to heretical tendencies of different kinds; for the letters to the Ephesians, Trallians, and Smyrnæans are anti-docetic; that to the Philadelphians opposes Judaistic parties; while the epistle to the Magnesians commingles anti-docetic with anti-judaising remarks. The writer was in much the same position as the present post-pauline author, living as he did in the age of heresies.

It naturally follows that the division of paragraphs and passages between Gnostic opponents of different complexions is only an ingenious attempt to introduce

[1] *Bibel-Lexicon*, vol. iv. p. 400.

an element of which the author was himself unconscious. The portraiture is too vague and shifting for precise partitioning. The assumed Paul draws from the present and glances at the future. Occupying a peculiar position, living after Jewish Christianity had been pretty much overcome, he throws into his descriptions single traits of Jewish gnosis with others of a different tendency. Betraying an antagonism to incipient Valentinianism or rather Ophitism, he does not belong to the flourishing time of Gnosticism but to an earlier part of the second century.

It is curious to note how the present and future are interchanged. Thus the persons described as belonging to the last days, which are still future (2 Tim. iii. 1–5), are identified with the present generation (verse 6). In 2 Tim. iv. 3, 4, dangers referred to as future are treated as though Timothy had to encounter them in the present. The author's standpoint is amid emerging Gnosticism ; and his allusions to the future are the product of reflection, but of reflection confined within limits suitable to Pauline authorship. His present is the assumed Paul's future. And the latter disagrees with the apostle's theology, for the *appearing* or *epiphany* of Jesus Christ (1 Tim. vi. 14), is vaguely postponed till the latter times shall have passed. The writer gives directions about ecclesiastical matters as though the second advent were in the distant future. To the steadfast confessor, the heavenly kingdom begins after death ; while Paul puts it after the believer's resurrection from the dead. Thus we read, 'The Lord will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom' (2 Tim. iv. 18); whereas 1 Cor. xv. 25 says, 'For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet.' The apostle believes in a kingdom upon earth initiated by Christ at his second coming, an event he himself expects to see ; but our writer views that kingdom as one in heaven

identical with that which is to follow the millennial one. The earthly kingdom in which the saints reign with Christ disappears from our epistles, and the heavenly one that succeeds the resurrection takes its place. 'The Lord will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom,' that is, his kingdom in heaven. There is nothing about surviving the Messianic reign on earth.

Heresy could not play an important part among the questions that occupied Paul's mind; nor could he put a settled creed over against a wrong gnosis; for such things did not come up in his time. The fundamental principles of Christianity, justification by faith and the redeeming power of Christ's death, filled his soul till he overcame the primitive position of the Jewish Christians. Our epistles present another horizon than Paul's, under which his distinguishing doctrines are neither enumerated nor developed. The dogmatic cycle of the apostolic age is assumed; and it has only to be upheld in its manifold applications to practical life. The time has come for conserving the apostolic treasure, not for discussing or adding to it. The theology of the epistles leans upon the past and is the church's foundation. Authority, organisation, officialism, are the preservatives of sound doctrine. The faithful gospel already established needs only to be rightly divided to produce its moral effect in the conduct of believers; while empty and profitless speculations about the law, dualistic hypotheses, geneological ranks and like matters are to be avoided. Instead of the spontaneous utterances of the early believers who spoke as they were moved by the spirit, *teaching* is enforced. The unpremeditated effusions of inspired brethren rising up in assemblies belong to the past; for Timothy and Titus themselves needing to study are enjoined to see that such assemblies have qualified presbyters and deacons. It is the epoch of organisation, when the original mode of fellowship is gradually

giving place to a monarchical form of government emerging out of presbytery; and a compact church resting upon traditional doctrine becomes a prominent factor in godliness.[1]

Much has been written about episcopacy in connection with Timothy and Titus; but most of the discussions are profitless. Whether they were prototypes of bishops in the modern sense of the title, or of archbishops and metropolitans; whether they were provincial or local bishops, vicars apostolic or presiding presbyter-bishops, are questions of no importance. In the epistles before us, an official pre-eminence is naturally assigned to them at a time when the monarchical principle was in its incipient stage. The true date of the pastorals accounts for the ecclesiastical superintendence of Timothy and Titus; but whether their position should be taken as an argument for modern episcopacy resolves itself into expediency. The indications of apostolic or post-apostolic arrangements respecting churches are followed by the ecclesiastics who suppose that such arrangements were intended for all circumstances; but the varying conditions of the world prevent a close adherence to the past. The process of development, which the right-minded guide into the channel of truth, goes on in spite of the votaries to olden usages.

13. The epistles belong to the first quarter of the second century, probably between A.D. 115–125, and refer to false teachers like those of the Colossian epistle. They were the forerunners of Valentinian Gnosticism, Ophitism, and Marcionism, including Jewish Christians of an Essene tendency, whose speculations transgressed the limits put to right doctrine by the nascent catholic Church. Paulinism had been attenuated by the altered circumstances of the times, and by the conscious feeling of organic unity over against increasing errors. Christianity appears as an objective thing. The modified

[1] See Holtzmann's *Die Pastoralbriefe*, p. 191, etc.

Paulinism of the epistles is in the direction of practical piety.

14. If it be asked whether the three epistles proceeded from one author or more, the answer must be in favour of one, though there are perceptible distinctions among them, not only in ideas but in the circumstances out of which they arose. The first epistle to Timothy was written last; the second was first of the three. With this agrees the fact of Hymeneus's mention in the second without any special censure; while in the first he is delivered to Satan. And if the identity of Alexander (2 Tim. iv. 14; 1 Tim. i. 20) be assumed, he is solemnly excommunicated in the latter (not the former). In 2 Timothy, the false teachers are commonly referred to in general terms; in 1 Timothy they are more definitely pointed at. In the former, there is no trace of a docetic allusion; in the latter one occurs in ii. 5. In the former, Timothy appears as an evangelist without mention of other officers; in the latter, not only are elders and deacons mentioned, but the elders are a college from which Timothy received ordination. An incipient elevation of the bishop above the elders is noticeable. Thus offices in the church already exist, and are alluded to as a settled institution. The bishop, who is spoken of in the singular while the elders are plural, has the chief supervision of the church, and is to see that all things are rightly conducted. The monarchical principle had already appeared. In 2 Timothy sufferings and afflictions are referred to (i. 8; ii. 3–12); but in 1 Timothy they are unnoticed; kings and magistrates being prayed for as protectors of the church. For this reason Pfleiderer places the one epistle under Trajan; the other under Hadrian. But the basis is too slight for this. All that can be safely held is that the three were written in the following order, 2 Timothy, Titus, 1 Timothy, by one author.

The first is inferior in composition and style to the

other two. Its authenticity has therefore been impugned more than they, especially since Schleiermacher criticised it unfavourably. Its author repeated himself to some extent. That addressed to Titus is suitable in part to the circumstances supposed, and is written with some ability, though it is not equal to the second to Timothy, which breathes an apostolic spirit. In consequence of the latter's superior tone, its authenticity is held more tenaciously than that of the other two. It is defended as Paul's by Reuss, who surrenders the first to Timothy and that to Titus as un-Pauline. Other critics assign no more than parts of it to the apostle himself: Weisse, ch. iv. 9–22; Hausrath, i. 1–2, 15–18, iv. 9–18; Pfleiderer, i. 15–18, iv. 9–21; Ewald, i. 15–18, iv. 9–15, 18–22. It is possible that iv. 9–21 may have come from Paul at Cæsarea; but the leaving of Trophimus at Miletus does not agree with Acts xxi. 29.

The finding of authentic fragments is not confined to 2 Timothy; one has been discovered in Titus iii. 12–15.

The similarity of the three is too great and the circumstances implied in them too late, to allow of the authenticity of one at the expense of the others. Eichhorn carried out Schleiermacher's critical process to its legitimate result in denying the authenticity of all.

We rest in the conclusion that the author was a Pauline Christian who lived at Rome in the first part of the second century and wished to confirm the incipient catholic Church in the old paths, by exhortations to piety and warnings against error. His view was polemical only in part. To the growing dangers of the time he opposed the orthodox doctrine of the church and a well-ordered ecclesiastical organisation; interspersing practical precepts to regulate the conduct of different Christians. The Pauline doctrine of justification by faith receded; good works

advanced to be a factor and condition of salvation.[1] Like many others of his day, the author chose the name of an apostle to give currency to his sentiments. Being impressed with the idea that a united church with sound doctrine was the best safeguard against heresy, he chose Timothy and Titus as the superintendents of churches, to whom Paul might address directions about ecclesiastical organisation and heretical views. In all this there was no dishonesty. The device was a harmless one. The age was very far from being able to estimate evidence. The orthodox Church was not critical; neither was it averse to receive publications favourable to itself. Heretics were more critical though subject to caprice. The epistles must have commended themselves immediately as Paul's; for though he was long dead, the writings afterwards pronounced canonical were not yet separated from the uncanonical, and comparatively few knew of the existence of a fresh work for years. The doctrinal system of the epistles differs both from genuine Paulinism and from the Johannine type; but is nearer the latter than the former. Christianity in conflict with persecutions and heretics is the power which obtains the victory over the world—the absolute and only truth, in whose maintenance all proper means should be applied—such is the common ground of the pastoral letters and fourth gospel. But the former want the mystic element of the latter. Being practical rather than theoretical they have not its peculiar Gnosticism. Their faded Paulinism reflects Hellenic culture feebly, and lacks the impress of Alexandrian philosophy.

The supposititious character of the pastoral epistles is held by other critics than those belonging to the Tübingen school. Not only De Wette, but Ewald, Mangold, Meyer, Hilgenfeld and Holtzmann favour it. The stream of criticism is too strong against the advo-

[1] 1 Tim. vi. 18.

cates of tradition to be successfully resisted. When moderate theologians like Usteri, Lücke, Neander and Bleek give up the authenticity of the first epistle to Timothy, the other letters cannot be saved from the same fate without logical inconsistency.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

CONTENTS.

THIS BOOK may be divided into two parts, viz. i.–xii., and xiii.–xxviii., the former of which represents Peter, the latter Paul, as the prominent apostle. It commences with the ascension of Christ, and is not so much a continuation as an amplified edition of Luke xxiv. 50–53. The narrative of the gospel is not properly continued till Acts i. 15. In writing a second book, the evangelist repeats and enlarges some particulars given at the end of the first. His description of the circumstances attending the ascension differs materially from the former one. According to the gospel, the time of that event was the day of the resurrection; according to the Acts, the fortieth day after. According to the former, it took place at Bethany; according to the latter, from the Mount of Olives. The last words spoken by Jesus are not the same; nor were they uttered at the same place, for the gospel represents them as spoken at Jerusalem; the Acts, on the Mount of Olives.

After the ascension, the apostles returned to Jerusalem, and continued along with the disciples in prayer. On Peter's proposal to fill up Judas's place in the apostolic college, the lot fell upon Matthias.

The second chapter describes the descent of the Holy Spirit on the disciples and its effect, with the

discourse of Peter, which was the means of converting three thousand souls (ii. 1–41). That the writer means to express the fact, that the people on whom the Holy Ghost fell were suddenly and miraculously endowed with the gift of speaking languages which they had not learned, is plain from his words. The expression, 'to speak with other tongues,' equivalent to Mark's 'to speak with new tongues' (xvi. 17), is contrasted with 'in our own tongue, wherein we were born,' i.e. our mother-speech. It is true that the evidence for foreign languages being really spoken is contained entirely in the verses relating to the conflux of foreigners and their remarks on what they heard; but the writer evidently adopted the opinion expressed by the foreigners. The chapter closes with a description of the life of the primitive believers. In a community of goods, the needs of all were supplied (ii.).

The first persecution, which fell on the two heads of the new church, was occasioned by the cure of a lame man by Peter at the gate of the temple. The people ran together to Peter and John, greatly wondering; and were addressed by the former in bold language. But the priests and Sadducees came upon them, and put them in prison. The next day they were examined before the Sanhedrim, whose sentence was that they should not speak thereafter in the name of Jesus. Having been dismissed, they went to their friends, whose prayer on the occasion is given (iii., iv.).

The account of the sudden deaths of Ananias and Sapphira represents them as punishments supernaturally inflicted by Peter, and cannot be explained on other principles. The miraculous power put forth by the apostles is said to have led to another persecution. They were imprisoned by the Jews, but supernaturally set free during the night by an angel. In the morning, being taken before the Sanhedrim, and having answered as before, they were dismissed, agreeably to the counsel

of Gamaliel, after they had been chastised and forbidden to teach in the name of Jesus (v.).

The 6th chapter describes the election of seven deacons, whose office was to relieve the apostles by attending to the pecuniary affairs of the Church ; and the persecution of Stephen, one of the number, who preached with great power and did many miracles. Having been brought before the Jewish council, this zealous convert made his defence, and was stoned.

The charge against him is alleged to be blasphemy against God and the law of Moses, though the witnesses that said so are styled false witnesses. It is plain that he had expressed himself in a way that appeared irreligious to the zealous Jews respecting the temple-worship and the law, by announcing the approaching downfall of Mosaism, occasioned by the religion of Jesus of Nazareth. He had stated the essential opposition between Judaism and Christianity, though the form which that opposition took in his mind and speech does not appear very clearly. The discourse has two parallel sides, an enumeration of the benefits which God had conferred on the people from the earliest time, and the conduct of the people toward God. The relation of the Jewish nation to Jehovah is its leading idea. Hence it takes a historical course, consisting of two parts, one embracing the period from Abraham to Moses, the other from Moses till that of David and Solomon. But how was this general point of view related to Stephen's own cause ? He was accused of speaking disrespectfully of divine institutions ; how does the historical summary of the Jewish nation meet that accusation ? In showing that his enemies resisted the will of God by their obstinate attachment to outward forms. The people were from the beginning unable to understand the divine procedure, because they rejected Moses and fell away into idolatry. The ceremonial and sensuous element occupied their minds. It continued to do so with

respect to Solomon's temple, for they clung to such service with an obstinacy that prevented them from perceiving the spiritual nature of Jehovah's worship. Thus the Jews are charged by Stephen with resistance to religion properly so called. His defence is a counter accusation. While they blamed him for hinting that the theocracy would be abolished in Christ, and the temple-service cease, he shows even from the Old Testament their ingratitude to God, and inability to apprehend the spiritual nature of religion, by an obstinate adherence to ceremonial institutions. He justifies the new religion in opposition to the old by the Scriptures themselves, and virtually admits the charge brought against him of irreligiousness in hinting at the abolition of the Jewish economy (vi., vii.).[1]

The death of Stephen was the commencement of a general and violent persecution of the church at Jerusalem, whose members were all driven from the city, except the apostles. By this means Christianity was carried into Samaria, where Philip preached Christ to the people, and wrought miracles among them. Even Simon the sorcerer believed and was baptized. Peter and John, whom the apostles at Jerusalem sent to Samaria, imparted the Holy Spirit to the new converts by the imposition of hands. This leads to Peter's coming in contact with Simon, whose corrupt disposition he denounces. Philip seems to have returned with the apostles to Jerusalem; whence on the way to Gaza he joined an Ethiopian eunuch, and converted him to Christianity. One conspicuous effect of Stephen's martyrdom was the conversion of Paul, described in the 9th chapter, which took place suddenly, as he was on his way to Damascus. Smitten with blindness, his companions led him by the hand into Damascus, where Ananias, guided by a vision, restored his sight, and imparted to him the fulness of the Holy Spirit. Having

[1] See Baur's *Paulus*, pp. 41–59.

remained some days with the disciples, he preached in the synagogues with power. But after a considerable time he was compelled to fly, in consequence of a plot to slay him. Coming to Jerusalem, he was at first avoided by the Christians there, till Barnabas introduced him to the apostles, to whom he became a powerful help in proclaiming the name of Jesus. Here, however, a new conspiracy to take away his life induced the brethren to send him to Cæsarea and Tarsus (viii., ix. 1–31).

This is followed by an account of Peter's journey to visit the saints at Lydda, where he healed Eneas who had been lame for eight years ; and recalled Tabitha to life in Joppa (ix. 32–43).

The act of Peter in converting and baptizing Cornelius makes him the first apostle who introduced Gentiles into the Christian Church (x. 1–xi. 18).

Saul had vanished from the history at ix. 30, but reappears in xi. 19–30, a paragraph relating to the inhabitants of Antioch who received the gospel. Barnabas having been sent from Jerusalem to Antioch, brought Saul from Tarsus to that place, where the two spent a year in evangelising the people. A famine in Judea led them to undertake a journey to Jerusalem with a contribution for the poor brethren.

xii. 1–24, relating to the persecution of the Christians at Jerusalem, the capture and miraculous deliverance of Peter, with Herod's death, serves as an introduction to the more extended account of Paul which follows. The two delegates returned to Antioch, taking John Mark with them, whence they set forth on their first missionary journey. In Cyprus, Saul encountered Elymas a Jewish sorcerer, whom he smote with blindness. On this occasion the proconsul Sergius Paulus believed. The writer now adopts the name *Paul* for the first time, supposing, perhaps, that the name was changed in honour of one who was the most

distinguished of his early converts. Leaving Cyprus, Paul and his companions came to Perga and thence to Antioch in Pisidia, where he presented himself in the synagogue and addressed the Jews in a speech which began with the history of the people in Egypt, and coming down to David announced Jesus as a saviour, attested as such by his death and resurrection. On the next sabbath when the gospel was preached, the Jews violently opposed and contradicted the evangelical message, on which account the speakers turned to the more docile Gentiles. Persecuted by the Jews, Paul and Barnabas left Antioch and came to Iconium, where they preached with success till forced to fly to Lystra and Derbe. At the former place, Paul healed a cripple, in consequence of which the inhabitants took him and Barnabas for Hermes and Zeus, and had almost offered sacrifice to them. Jewish emissaries from Antioch and Iconium persuaded the people that the apostle was an enemy to religion, so that he was stoned, and soon left Lystra for Derbe, whence he returned to the place he set out from, by Lystra, Iconium, Antioch, Pamphylia, Perga, and Attalia (xiii., xiv.).

The 15th chapter relates that while Paul and Barnabas abode at Antioch after their first missionary tour, a dispute arose about the obligation of the Gentile converts to observe circumcision and the law of Moses. To settle the matter, the two, with some others, were sent to Jerusalem, where, in an assembly of the apostles and elders in which Peter and James spoke, it was resolved that the Jewish Christians only should conform to the law; but that the Gentile converts should be absolved from it, with the exception of abstinence from food offered to idols, blood, things suffocated, and fornication. An epistle to this effect was brought back, which rejoiced the church at Antioch.

Some time after, the apostle of the Gentiles undertook a second missionary journey, not with Barnabas,

for they separated on account of Mark ; but with Silas. On this occasion he went through Syria, Cilicia, and Lycaonia, circumcising Timothy in the last-mentioned place, and publishing the Jerusalem decrees. Traversing Phrygia and Galatia, and forbidden by the Holy Spirit to preach in proconsular Asia, they came through Mysia to Troas, where Paul had a night-vision inviting him to Macedonia. Accordingly he sailed for Macedonia, and stopped at Philippi. Here, as Paul and his friends were going to the place of prayer, they met Lydia, a damsel possessing powers of divination, from whom the apostle expelled the demon. Enraged at the loss of their income through her, the masters of this slave took Paul and Silas before the duumvirs, who had them scourged and imprisoned. But at midnight, when the captives had prayed and sung praises, there was an earthquake that opened all the prison doors and released the inmates from their fetters ; which occurrence, united to the conduct and words of the apostles, made so great on impression on the gaoler, that he took them into his house and entertained them, became a believer and received baptism with his whole house. Next morning the magistrates told them that they might leave the prison. But Paul, appealing to his privilege of Roman citizenship, would not accept the offer till they themselves conducted them forth and so acknowledged publicly that they had acted unjustly (xv. 36–xvi.).

Leaving Philippi, the brethren came to Thessalonica, where the unbelieving Jews, as usual, stirred up an opposition which led to a speedy departure from the place, following them even to Berœa, where a good reception had been given to the gospel message. After this, Paul appears at Athens alone, and delivers a speech on Mars' hill, showing considerable dialectic skill and reflection. Christianity is contrasted with polytheistic heathenism ; but the doctrine of the resurrection, to

which the speaker soon brings his hearers, proves an effectual stumbling-block to their minds, as might have been foreseen, and the discourse is broken off (xvii.).

From Athens, Paul came to Corinth, where he found Aquila and his wife. Here he met with violent opposition from the Jews, who raised a tumult and charged him before the proconsul Gallio with teaching that Jesus was the Messiah. The governor prudently declined to interfere in religious disputes. After staying a year and a half at least in Corinth, Paul sailed to Syria along with Priscilla and Aquila; first shaving his head in Cenchrea, as he had a vow resting upon him. He made but a brief stay in Ephesus, landed at Cæsarea, went up to Jerusalem to be present at one of the feasts, and returned thence to Antioch (xviii. 1–22).

The time now spent in Antioch was probably short. The apostle departing on his third missionary tour, went over Galatia and Phrygia, strengthening the disciples in the new religion (xviii. 23).

As an introduction to the account of Paul's visit to Ephesus at this time, we have a notice of Apollos an Alexandrian Jew, who was instructed more accurately in Christianity by Aquila and Priscilla, and passed over to Corinth, where he co-operated with the Christians in promulgating and defending the truth. After he left Ephesus, Paul arrived there, and found certain disciples of John the Baptist whom he taught and had rebaptized, communicating to them at the same time the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, by which they spoke new languages and prophesied. Here the apostle preached with much success, extending his efforts to the province itself. For about three years he laboured in the capital or surrounding parts, and performed uncommon miracles; sweat-cloths and aprons which had touched his body being supposed to have healing efficacy. Certain Jewish exorcists were defeated in their

attempt to imitate the apostle; since the evil spirit whom they tried to expel urged the possessed man to leap on and overpower them. In consequence of this event many believed: those who practised magic arts burned the books containing their mysteries—books worth the very large sum of fifty thousand drachmæ. About the time of Paul's intended departure, Demetrius excited a tumult; the mob seized two of the apostle's companions and rushed to the theatre; but the city-recorder succeeded in quelling the uproar and dispersing the multitude (xviii. 24–xix.).

Leaving Ephesus, Paul proceeded to carry out his previous design of visiting Jerusalem, after passing through Macedonia and Achaia. Accordingly he came to Greece and abode there three months. To avoid an ambuscade of the Jews, he took the circuitous route through Macedonia to Asia Minor. Sailing from Philippi he came to Troas, where he preached on the first day of the week, and restored to life a young man who had fallen down from an upper window. From Troas, Paul and his friends came to Assos, Samos, and Miletus. From Miletus he sent for the Ephesian elders and addressed them in touching words, reminding them of his fidelity in the ministerial office and his conduct among them. Telling them that they and he were about to be separated for ever, he charged them to watch carefully over the flock, which was soon to be exposed to many dangers. The chapter concludes with a notice of his prayer, and re-embarkation (xx.).

Continuing the voyage to Tyre, the apostle and his companions proceeded thence to Ptolemais, Cæsarea, and Jerusalem. In the metropolis of Judea the elders of the church advised him to join four men who had undertaken a vow, in the same course of public consecration; that the people might see he still adhered to the Jewish law. But when the seven days were on the eve of completion, the apostle was seized by the Jews

and dragged from the temple. In the act of their beating him the Roman commander had time to rescue him from their hands. Having got permission from the chief captain to address the people from the stairs leading up to the castle, he spoke in Hebrew, narrating his Jewish education and early zeal for the law, his conversion, and how he subsequently worshipped in the temple. When he came to mention his mission to the heathen, they would listen no longer. The chiliarch, thinking him guilty of some flagrant offence, determined to extort a confession from him by scourging, but desisted on hearing that the prisoner was a Roman citizen. After he had been kept in chains during the night, he was sent for examination to the Sanhedrim, and made his defence before them. But he was interrupted at the commencement of it, by the high-priest Ananias. To secure the voice of the majority he resorted to an artifice, by which he gained the favour of the Pharisees. After this there was a conspiracy of the Jews to slay him, which was disclosed to the Roman commander by a relation of the apostle's, and therefore he was sent to Cæsarea under the protection of a military guard by night, with a letter to Felix the governor. Here the apostle was arraigned and made his defence (xxi.–xxiv. 23).

Some days after, he preached before Felix and Drusilla, but was kept a prisoner till the procurator was superseded in office by Festus, who refused to send Paul to Jerusalem. Hence the Jews went down to Cæsarea to bring their charges against the prisoner, which they did accordingly, but were defeated in their vengeance by Paul's appeal to Cæsar. When Festus conferred with Agrippa on the matter, the apostle was brought before the latter, and spoke as he had done before on the stairs of the castle, dwelling on the wonderful circumstances of his conversion, his innocence, and faithful

adherence to the law, so that Agrippa pronounced him innocent (xxiv. 24–xxvi.).

The 27th and 28th chapters are occupied with the apostle's voyage and journey to Rome, his interviews with the Jews there, and captivity. Embarking at Cæsarea, he and his companions arrived at Myra, in the south of Lycia. The incidents of the voyage from Myra to Crete are recorded, with the storm that raged after they passed cape Matala and destroyed all hope of safety. But the apostle cheered his fellow-voyagers with the prospect of deliverance ; and though shipwrecked on the island of Malta, those on board escaped to the shore by swimming or by fragments of the vessel. During the winter, they abode in Malta, and then prosecuted the journey to Rome, where the history terminates abruptly (xxvii., xxviii.).

THE TITLE.

The title,[1] *Acts of apostles*, or as D. has it, *way of acting of apostles*,[2] was not well selected. The apostles Peter and Paul only are prominent in the book, John and James being mentioned incidentally. The title is too comprehensive. It is also too restricted, because individual teachers of Christianity, who were not apostles, are mentioned more or less fully. Thus Stephen is introduced in vi. 8–viii. 1. In viii. 5–40, Philip's proceedings are described. In xi. 19–30 others are spoken of. Many parts relate to the spread and establishment of Christianity, the organisation of churches, etc., having no immediate reference to apostles. It is not easy, however, to find a pertinent title so short as the usual one. The name of Luke as the author does not appear in uncial MSS. The later and cursive ones alone have it ;

[1] *πράξεις ἀποστόλων.*

[2] *πράξις ἀποστόλων.* The common reading is *πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων*, contrary to the Vatican MS. which omits the article. The Sinaitic has *πράξεις* alone.

a fact which proves nothing either for or against the proper ascription of the work to him.

CREDIBILITY.

The general credibility of the Acts can only be tested by an examination of the contents. Does the internal character of the book attest its historic accuracy? It has been thought that the coincidences between it and the Pauline epistles prove the credibility of the narratives; and that there are no real discrepancies, but such substantial correspondence as might be expected from independent writers, each narrating the same things in his own manner and with different objects. Since Paley explored this field, many believe that he set the whole argument in its clearest light, and vindicated the credibility of both, by showing that the writer of the history did not copy from the author of the epistles or *vice versâ*, but that the coincidences are *undesigned*. Such evidence, however, has not appeared satisfactory to all. We shall examine it under the following heads.

1. The general conduct and teaching of the apostle Paul, as set forth in the work.

2. Various particulars in the book disagreeing with other writings.

3. The nature and form of the speeches interspersed.

4. The historical narratives.

1. The first thing that arrests the reader's attention is the repeated journeys which the apostle made to Jerusalem, some of which are satisfactorily explained, others not. Thus in xviii. 21, he would not consent to stay in Ephesus though requested to do so, but hastened to Jerusalem to keep the approaching feast. 'I must by all means keep this feast that cometh, at Jerusalem,' words strong enough to show the urgency of the occasion. It is true that they are omitted in several MSS., including the Sinaitic, but their genuineness is not im-

probable. In xix. 21, he came to a determination to go to Jerusalem while he was actively employed in Ephesus. In xx. 16, it is said that he was reluctant to spend the time in Asia, because he hasted, if it were possible, to be at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. In xxiv. 11, 18, he states that he went up to the metropolis to worship. It is unlikely that the apostle would have abandoned the field of his operations at Ephesus or elsewhere, merely for the sake of keeping a Jewish festival at Jerusalem; since his own epistles show how strongly he felt the non-obligation of Judaic observances. A pious Jew would have thought it right to do so, or even a Judaising Christian, not the apostle of the Gentiles with his decided anti-judaic tendencies. The way in which he acted on many occasions savours of the Jew, not of him who was the great instrument of severing the link between Judaism and Christianity. He shaved his head at Cenchrea because he had a vow. He underwent a process of Nazariteship in the temple with the view of averting the distrust of the Jewish Christians and of showing that he observed the law; a step which apologists strive to reconcile with his character, and therefore excuse as weak and hasty though originating in a good motive. Had it been so, he would soon have perceived his error, especially as it led to imprisonment. Yet he alludes to it in the discourse before Felix, without the slightest misgiving (xxiv. 18). It is true that he became as a Jew to the Jews (1 Cor. ix. 20); but that expression does not imply that he performed legal duties without a pressing necessity, or that he refrained from acting in accordance with his intense conviction of the law's invalidity. It does not consist with his performing or allowing circumcision, as the book of Acts represents him, because he himself makes circumcision incompatible with salvation by Christ (Gal. v. 2). Not only does he act as a pious Jew; his relations with Jewish Christianity are of the friendliest

sort. Immediately after his conversion, he joins the disciples at Jerusalem, speaking boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus. He receives special commendation from the church of the metropolis and their chiefs when he goes thither a third time. At his fourth visit he salutes the Jerusalemite church; and at his fifth he has a friendly reception, though prejudices are strong against him. His hostile relations towards Jewish Christians are passed over. Titus is unmentioned, though the apostle had a dispute at Jerusalem on his account. In like manner, Peter's appearance at Antioch and public rebuke there, are unnoticed. It is impossible to suppose that this silence is other than intentional. A pious observer of the law could not be a strong opponent of Judaising practices without obvious inconsistency.

According to the epistle to the Galatians, the apostle's mission was to the Gentiles from the very beginning (i. 16). Such is not his portrait in the Acts, where he appears in the synagogues at Damascus immediately after his conversion. Driven thence, he labours among his countrymen in and about Jerusalem. Visions and revelations are necessary to turn him away from the Jews to the Gentiles, which he does with apparent reluctance. Even on his extensive missionary tours he repairs to the synagogues, as in Cyprus, in Antioch of Pisidia, and Iconium. In Philippi he appears at a Jewish proseucha on the sabbath-day; at Thessalonica he discourses to Jews and proselytes on three successive sabbaths; at Berœa he goes into a synagogue of the Jews; at Athens he frequents a similar place. At Corinth he speaks in the synagogue every sabbath-day; and after the arrival of Silas and Timothy there, he testifies strongly to the Jews 'that Jesus was Christ.' It was not till they opposed and blasphemed, that he turned to the Gentiles. At his second visit to Ephesus, he went into the synagogue as he had done before, and spake boldly there for three months, till obstinate re-

sistance compelled him to find a more suitable place, a private not a public synagogue, where Jews as well as Greeks heard him patiently. At Rome he sent for the chief Jews, from whom he afterwards turned away saying, 'Be it known unto you that the salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles, and that *they* will hear it.' Thus the book sets forth a man who went systematically to Jews first, whom he continued to address till he was forced to seek another audience. Instead of being the apostle of the Gentiles from the first and uniformly, he sought his own countrymen, labouring among them till he could do so no longer, and leaving them with reluctance to go to the Gentiles. As the gospel was intended for all alike, Jews and Gentiles, the natural course would have been to seek an audience in places which circumstances indicated as suitable, whether among Jews or Gentiles. But the Acts make him go first to the Jews as a rule; which is the reverse of what we are warranted to infer from his own epistles.

The force of these remarks is not neutralised by saying that it would have been very difficult to get access to heathens except through the Jewish synagogues and the proselytes there; that it would not have suited his purpose or showed his tact to have gone to the Gentiles at once and entirely. But the revelation of Christ within him was one that pointed to the Gentiles at once; and he was further sanctioned in that direction by the elder apostles. Did he not see his special mission at the first? Did he soon abandon the Jerusalem compact, and go to the Jews as he had been doing before, according to the story of the Acts? Was his mind gradually opened up through the experience of outward circumstances till he forsook his custom of seeking out the Jews first, and turned to the Gentiles? We cannot think so. Neither expediency nor mental enlargement explains his conduct.

The nature of his teachings corresponds to his con-

duct, and is mostly apologetic. Brought into contact with the Jews, resisted and persecuted by them, he had to defend himself against their accusations and appeal to their Scriptures. This is exemplified in the 22nd, 24th, and 26th chapters. At Lystra and Athens, however, he spoke to Gentiles, so that we have the means of comparing his doctrine there with that which his epistles set forth. On both occasions the fundamental principles of monotheism are inculcated. There is this difference, however, that the Athenian discourse refers to the Messianic judgment, the certainty of which is said to be confirmed by the resurrection of Christ. In neither speech is there anything distinctively Pauline, such as justification by faith and redemption by the blood of Jesus. The discourse addressed to the Ephesian elders at Miletus is chiefly apologetic ; the only allusion to the nature of the apostolic teaching at Ephesus being in xx. 21, where the Pauline idea of the death of Christ is expressed. With this exception, nothing distinctively Pauline appears in it. The short address to the superstitious inhabitants of Lystra is general, and could not be expected to contain peculiar Pauline sentiments. At Antioch in Pisidia, the discourse before the Jews presents at the close the Pauline doctrine in a gentle form. 'Be it known unto you therefore that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins ; and by him all that believe are justified from *all* things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses' (xiii. 38, 39). This is the only passage in all the speeches put into Paul's mouth in the Acts, where there is a distinct reference to justification by faith. Elsewhere, the announcement of the resurrection of Jesus, and his Messiahship founded upon the Old Testament, form the substance of his doctrine. At Thessalonica he argues that the anointed One must needs suffer and rise from the dead, identifying him with Jesus. Before Felix, Festus, and Agrippa, the apostle speaks from the

same point of view. The Messiahship of Jesus is the main topic at issue between him and the Jews. The invalidity of the law in respect to justification, and the doctrine of justifying faith, are hardly alluded to; only once certainly; while repentance, and the doing of works meet for repentance (xxvi. 20), which is declared to be the sum of his teaching to Jews and Gentiles, is rather against that dogma; since the apostle himself applies the term repentance to moral improvement, not to the mental disposition which faith denotes.

The centre and substance of the Pauline ministry consisted in man's universal sinfulness, justification by faith without works, and the abolition of the law. How prominently these appear in the epistles to the Romans and Galatians is plain to every reader. None of them is inculcated in his discourses to Jews and Gentiles recorded in the Acts. One or two passing allusions to faith and the law are overridden by the constant attitude assumed towards the law, which is that of friendly recognition not of opposition. He is a Pharisee, an orthodox Jew, intent upon the salvation of his own countrymen in the first place, and careful to keep in abeyance the idea of justification by faith alone. In short, the apostle Peter, speaking in the Acts, goes as far as Paul. He preaches the forgiveness of sins oftener than the latter, calls the law an intolerable burden, and states universal salvation by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ (xv. 7–11).

This portrait of the apostle, so unlike that given in his own epistles, suggests the idea that the Acts were not written by an eyewitness and companion, but by a later hand, who had a special motive for the representation he gives; for it is impossible to believe that the regular prominence of certain features and the concealment of others were accidental.

2. Various particulars in the work corroborate the same conclusion.

The Acts say, that Paul after his conversion remained *some days* in Damascus, and forthwith preached Christ in the synagogues there; that when the Jews sought to kill him he was sent to Jerusalem, where the disciples looked upon him with suspicion, till Barnabas convinced them of his sincerity; that he resumed his work of teaching the Jews, till he was again compelled to flee from Jerusalem and return to Tarsus. But in the 4th chapter of the epistle to the Galatians he himself informs us that, immediately after his conversion, he went to Arabia, whence he returned to Damascus, and after three years went up to Jerusalem. The text of the Acts does not admit of the insertion of this Arabian journey even in the 'many days' of the twenty-third verse (chap. ix.), because the days refer, according to the context, to Damascus, not to that place with Arabia. Still less does it admit of the visit to Arabia being placed before the notice of his active preaching, 'and immediately,' ix. 20; for the direct succession of 'and immediately' to 'some days in Damascus' excludes from between them a journey to Arabia. The retirement into Arabia, wherever inserted in the narrative of the Acts—and it has been thrust into various places—proves a refractory incident. What is plainer than the fact, that the historian was unaware of any interruption between Paul's conversion and his active preaching in Damascus; or that his narrative is inconsistent with it? According to the Acts, when Paul came from Damascus to Jerusalem, and the disciples there did not believe he was a convert—a fact that must have been well known at the metropolis if more than three years had elapsed since his conversion—Barnabas brought him *to the apostles*, with whom he was associated for a time. This disagrees with the epistle to the Galatians, which states that he went to Jerusalem *to see Peter*, and saw none else there *except James*. Paul's own account excludes John; that of the Acts includes him. Trip himself

admits that there is an inexactness here.[1] It is vain to assert that the narrative in the Acts confines Paul's preaching to a small section of unbelievers, not the genuine Jews but the Hellenists. If he was with the apostles, 'going in and out' and 'speaking boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus,' he could not have been personally unknown to the majority of the Christians in Jerusalem; nor does the narrative in the Acts restrict his preaching to the Hellenists, who are specified solely with a view to show that they attempted to apprehend him because they had been confounded by his arguments. On the contrary, it is stated in xxvi. 20, that he showed to *them at Jerusalem and throughout all the coasts of Judea*, that they should repent. How does this language consist with a restricted sphere at Jerusalem, excluding Judea? So far from sanctioning such subterfuges of exposition, it makes the contradiction between the apostle's own language, that he 'was unknown by face to the churches in Judea,' and the account which the Acts gives of his first visit to Jerusalem and association with the apostles, more palpably opposite. When Trip says that the language of xxvi. 20 refers to the entire ministry of the apostle among Jews and Gentiles from his conversion till the moment at which the words were spoken, he fails to see that the original Greek discountenances the explanation. 'I showed' should be in the present-perfect, not a mere past tense, to justify the supposition.

The journey to Jerusalem mentioned in the 2nd chapter of Galatians, if it refers to the events recorded in the 15th chapter of the Acts, presents various disagreements with the latter, which discredit its accuracy. And that it *does* refer to the third visit of the Acts when the Apostolic council was held, appears from the impossibility of bringing it into connection with the second visit of the Acts (xi. 30), because it

[1] *Paulus nach der Apostelgeschichte*, p. 70.

was fourteen years at least later than the conversion of the apostle (Gal. ii. 1), probably sixteen or seventeen; whereas the second visit of the Acts took place about the time of Herod Agrippa's death, i.e. A.D. 44, or about nine years after the apostle's conversion. It is also certain, that the visit spoken of in Gal. ii. cannot be that of Acts xviii., i.e. the fourth of the Acts, because the circumstances narrated by Paul himself exclude a previous settlement of the questions in dispute. Had the apostle's own principles respecting the admission of the Gentiles to the privileges of the gospel and the impossibility of justification by the law been formally sanctioned by the heads of the Jerusalemite church, Peter and James, he could not have gone up to Jerusalem to expound his gospel to the pillars of the Church and get their approbation, lest his labours among the heathen should prove to be unwarranted. We are therefore justified in assuming that the journey to Jerusalem in Gal. ii. coincides with that mentioned in the 15th chapter of the Acts. If so, they do not harmonise, whatever minor points of similarity the two present.

The story in the Acts is—

(*a.*) That Paul and Barnabas went up as deputies from the church at Antioch; the apostle himself says that he went by 'a revelation.' It is possible to combine the two causes by assuming that the apostle had a revelation prompting him to go while he and Barnabas were sent by the church—that the external and internal coincided in time and purpose; but it is still remarkable that he makes no mention of the Judaisers who occasioned the appeal to Jerusalem, nor the church's commission with which he was entrusted. If it be said that he had no motive for mentioning the external cause of his journey when writing to the Galatians, that all his concern was a personal one, viz. to defend his preaching of the gospel, we answer, that as the official character of the mission might have led to the misconception that

he acknowledged a relation of dependence on the Jerusalem church, an allusion to the Judaisers at Antioch and the delegation would have corroborated his statement in the 1st chapter of the Galatian epistle.

(*b.*) The book of the Acts speaks of a formal transaction, a public council held under the presidency of James, at which there was discussion, terminating in decrees embodied in a particular document, to be communicated to the Gentile Christian congregations in the name of the metropolitan church by special messengers.

On the other hand, the Galatian epistle only speaks of Paul having a private conference with the heads of the Jerusalem church who approved of his conduct.

The difficulty is not removed by supposing with Neander, that the private conference was preparatory to the public meeting ; since the silence of Paul respecting the decrees of the assembly remains unexplained. Why should he speak of a preparatory measure and omit the decisive proceeding ? It has been said indeed that he alludes to the main point, viz. what proved to his Judaising opponents among the Galatians that the leading apostles were on his side and approved of his principles ; but surely the formal document would have shown it better. Appeal to decrees in which speeches delivered openly before the church at Jerusalem by Peter and James resulted, would have silenced his enemies more effectually. That appeal would have involved no concession on his part ; nor would it have interfered with his own determination.

Some find a place in the apostle's statement for a public communication of his principles as well as a private one, which, if correct, gives a step towards harmony between the two narratives. 'And I went up by revelation, and communicated *unto them* that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation,' etc. (Gal. ii. 2). It is alleged that the word *them* refers to the Christians in Jerusalem,

to whom the apostle explained his gospel in public. Such public statement before the church agrees with the idea of an assembly described in the Acts. Not to insist on the incongruity of putting the public explanation before the private conference, we observe that the pronoun *them* means *the apostles*, and is interpreted in the following words, 'but privately to them of reputation.' The persons alluded to indefinitely at first, are immediately characterised as the leading apostles.

(*c.*) The decrees of the council recognised the validity of the law for Jewish Christians. How could Paul have assented to that without opposition? One who affirmed, 'if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing,' could not consistently approve of Christians being circumcised.

(*d.*) The epistle to the Galatians says that the only thing which the apostles recommended to Paul was that he should remember the poor at Jerusalem. How could this be, if he consented to the imposition of prohibitions on Gentile Christians from which he declared their deliverance,—for he recommends abstinence from meats offered to idols only where the conscience of weak brethren would be offended by the opposite conduct? (1 Cor. ix.) He says in the Galatian epistle that the elder apostles added nothing to his knowledge; was it no addition to his teaching that he should inculcate on Gentile Christians abstinence from things which he himself pronounces indifferent?

(*e.*) The story in the Acts represents the church at Jerusalem with the primitive apostles at its head as a court of appeal by which disputed questions should be settled, and whose decisions Paul himself acknowledged, for he took charge of the decrees and gave copies to the churches he visited. But there was much disputation or discussion in the assembly of the apostles and elders, implying a conflict of opinion. Does it not indicate that Paul and Barnabas were on one side with respect

to circumcision and the elder apostles on the other ? In the Galatian epistle Paul occupies no subordinate position and submits to no external authority. His principles are settled. He sees clearly the right of the Gentiles to all the privileges of Christianity, and the abrogation of the Mosaic law. He could not, therefore, regard the points in dispute as debatable. 'If ye be circumcised,' he says, 'Christ shall profit you nothing.' He did not need to arrive at the conviction that the Mosaic law and all its ordinances were abolished, as late as fourteen or fifteen years after his conversion. According to his own statement, he went to Jerusalem agreeably to a divine impulse, for the purpose of explaining his principles to the apostles there, from whom he received no new light. Highly esteemed as they were, it made no difference to him. He did not want their judicial sentiments but their unconditional recognition of his teaching. He even refers to them in depreciatory language, 'those who seemed to be somewhat, whatsoever they were it maketh no matter to me,' i.e. whatever authority or reputation they had was to him a matter of indifference. The terms are depreciatory of the apostles themselves rather than of the extravagant claims set up for them by the Judaisers.

(*f.*) The story in the Acts leads us to infer, that amid the conflict of opinion the apostles gave way to Paul. Peter, James, and John conceded the point about the necessity of circumcision for Gentile converts. That they did so with some mental reservation or that they yielded to the force of circumstances for the sake of peace, appears from the whole spirit of the Jewish Christians at Jerusalem, as well as from the subsequent conduct of the apostles themselves.

The book of the Acts also intimates that Paul made concessions. He consented that the Gentile Christians should come under abstinence from meats offered to idols and fornication.

The declarations of Paul himself do not agree with this. According to the Galatian epistle, his position was one of independence, in which nothing was yielded. Least of all did he yield the point of abstinence from food offered to idols and fornication; because in the 8th chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians, he declares the eating or non-eating of such food to be a matter of indifference, and releases Christians from the obligation. And if fornication be associated with the other points, on account of its close connection with idolatry in the eyes of the Jews; if it be not introduced as a special moral precept but a part of the ancient Jewish opposition to everything that seemed to savour of idolatry; does not the connection imply at least a natural association between fornication and the things specified beside it; with meats offered to idols, for example? Does not the juxta-position imply that the things are all put in the same category? If Paul yielded the point of abstinence from food offered to idols, he conceded that of fornication at the same time. We know, however, that he considered the former a matter of indifference; if so, he would give a fair handle to his enemies for attributing to him the same opinion relative to fornication. It is wholly improbable, therefore, that he would have consented to the position which the decrees give to abstinence from fornication. The collocation of 'fornication' would make his inner nature revolt.

The difficulty is not solved by alleging the interval of time between the Jerusalem congress and the dates of the epistles to the Corinthians and Galatians. It has been said that the articles of peace, though useful for an emergency, were incapable of effecting or preserving a proper union between the Jewish and Gentile Christians and were consequently abandoned by Paul in writing to the Corinthians, about ten years after the council. This, however, does not touch the point of

fornication, which is connected in the decrees with food dedicated to idols. And how is it that Paul circumcised Timothy a considerable time after he refused to circumcise Titus? Did he retrograde in his principles? Not according to his own epistles. He knew the gospel by an inward revelation from the very first, and did not learn to accommodate his teaching or conduct to improper prejudices. The man who writes in the Galatian epistle, 'I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing,' was not likely to circumcise Timothy in deference to the Jews.

(*g.*) Did it imply no difference of belief, when it was agreed that Paul should go to the heathen, while James, Cephas, and John were to be apostles of the circumcision? Were the leading apostles and Paul agreed in the principle, even before the council, that both had the same gospel? Did both recognise the abrogation of circumcision for the Gentiles? Were they alike convinced that Gentile Christianity was independent of Judaism?

The answer must be in the negative, for the following reasons. Paul speaks of the primitive apostles in depreciatory language, in his epistle to the Galatians. Peter's subsequent conduct at Antioch indicates a want of thorough conviction that the Gentiles were entitled to exemption from all Judaism. And why did 'certain from James' lead Peter to a Judaising accommodation, if James fully believed in Paul's gospel of the uncircumcision? The persons indicated may indeed have used James's name improperly; but the natural meaning of the expression is, that the apostle sent them; that they had some authority from him which they did not abuse, else Peter would have known it at once. It is easy to style Peter's conduct a *blamable moral weakness*; but whence did such moral vacillation arise, if not from deficiency of right views respecting Gentile freedom? The disputation in the council leads to the same

conclusion, strengthening the opinion that the resolutions were a matter of compromise, without affecting the previous views of the parties respecting the necessity of circumcision. The sentiments of the elder apostles on that head may have been somewhat loosened; those of Paul were untouched. We place more reliance on the epistle to the Galatians and incidental particulars in the Acts of the Apostles, than upon the speeches put into the mouths of Peter and James at the council.

(*h.*) It is often said that the Galatian epistle represents Peter's view of Christian liberty respecting the Gentiles as identical with Paul's, or with that which he expressed in the apostolic convention at Jerusalem, because Paul attributes nothing more than *dissimulation* to him and the Jewish Christians at Antioch. Fear of the persons sent by James led him to conceal his true conviction and act as though he had an opposite one. But the language of the epistle does not agree with this. Paul said to Peter, 'If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?' How could Peter *compel* the Gentiles to live like the Jews if he had a conviction of its being wrong and improper? It is needless to talk of the compulsion of example, i.e. indirect compulsion, because the verb is inapplicable to that. De Wette observes, that Peter's dissimulation was an unconscious one, consisting in a want of firmness, clearness, and purity of conviction. The apostle was inconsistent, because he was not clearly persuaded in his mind of the admissibility of the Gentiles to all the privileges of Jewish Christians, even after the council at Jerusalem.

(*i.*) Still farther, the Acts say nothing of the efforts made to procure Titus's circumcision, which Paul resisted. And how could Peter at Antioch have acted contrary to the apostolic convention, or Paul have forgotten to appeal to its decisions when he rebuked Peter

there ? Could not Peter have silenced the zealots who came from James with a reference to the transactions which had taken place at Jerusalem, the resolutions of the apostolic college and the approbation of James himself ? What need had he to dissemble, or Paul to rebuke him on his own responsibility ?

These observations tend to show, that the decrees of the so-called council at Jerusalem, and the transactions connected with their enactment, have a more formal and exact character than really belonged to them. All that can be fairly deduced from the narrative is, that the assembly and its resolutions had not the nature of a council or authoritative enactments. The whole proceeding was consultative, not judicial. Whatever was agreed upon was not adhered to afterwards. The description bears on its face a conciliatory aim and cannot be accepted as exact, because Paul's subsequent language and conduct disagree with it.

We also see that the second visit of Paul to Jerusalem, the eleemosynary one mentioned in xi. 30, must be unhistorical. The apostle notices all his visits to Jerusalem prior to the writing of the Galatian epistle (Gal. i., ii.). To have omitted any would have defeated the purpose he had in view ; and the omission of the second noticed in the Acts is equivalent to its non-existence. If it be said that the twelve were not at Jerusalem then, that it was a season of terror and confusion, and that it would have been impossible for Paul to have conferred with the apostles at such a time of distress, the improbability of the visit is increased, because it would have been all the more to his purpose to have stated the fact of his being prevented from seeing the twelve at the time. The enumeration of all his journeys was necessary to define his relations to the primitive apostles and silence the calumnies of his opponents in Galatia. The bearing of that enumeration on the visits in question is direct. Barnabas may

have gone with the contribution to the poor saints at Jerusalem ; Paul did not. Even Meyer allows that the account of the second journey is 'partly unhistorical.'

The narrative of the gift of tongues bestowed on the apostles at Pentecost disagrees with the description of it given by the apostle Paul. The writer of the Acts supposes the gift to have consisted in the power of speaking new languages, because the strangers present express their astonishment at hearing Galileans speak in their own tongues. This implies that they understood the words of the discourse. But the first epistle to the Corinthians makes the gift of tongues consist in the utterance of inarticulate sounds in an ecstatic state —the expression of confused words, under an enthusiastic impulse. The contrast which the apostle draws between prophesying and speaking in tongues implies this. The one edifies the church, the other edifies none but the speaker, and needs an interpreter. Were all the members of a church to speak with tongues, and a person unlearned or unbelieving to go into their assembly, they would seem to him mad ; but if all prophesied, the unbelieving or unlearned man would be influenced by what the speakers said, and convinced that God was in them of a truth. The one is an intelligible, the other an unintelligible thing proceeding from an ecstatic, impassioned, rapturous state of mind. If the narrative in the Acts be thus opposed to Paul's statements, it cannot be historical. The phenomenon may have had a basis in fact ; but the turn given to it is of a later type. What the bases of it were we need not stop to inquire. Its form and direction proceeded from a symbolical design ; the leading idea of the writer being the Pauline universalism which appears in the third gospel. The new theocracy was not like the old restricted to one nation, but was meant to comprehend all peoples. Unity of language, a characteristic of the primeval state of man in paradise, afterwards destroyed

by his rebellion against God at Babel, was to be restored in the Messianic age; a type of which appeared at Sinai, when, according to Philo and the Rabbins, a voice issued from the mount, proclaiming the divine commands to all peoples in the seventy languages of the earth. The miraculous sound from heaven, and fiery tongue-shaped appearances, are evidently a reflection of the fiery manifestations on Sinai, while we are also reminded of the confusion of tongues at Babel. The Spirit speaks in the tongues of all peoples, at his first outpouring on the Church, as a parallel to the language of Sinai. Christianity is for all peoples, having a spiritual language intelligible throughout the earth.

The narrative in Acts. xxviii. 17, etc. does not consist with what we know of the church at Rome, from Paul's epistle to it. Three days after the apostle's arrival in that city, he called the chief Jews together and told them his position, saying that he had nothing to accuse his nation of, and had therefore sent for them to explain the circumstances in which he was placed; that it was solely his belief in Messiah, the hope of Israel, which caused him to be a prisoner. Their reply was, that they had not received letters from Judea concerning him; nor had any of his brethren that came spoken evil of him. At the same time they expressed a wish to hear his sentiments; for they knew that the sect he belonged to was everywhere spoken against.

The epistle to the Romans shows that an important church had existed there for several years, a church whose faith was spoken of throughout the whole world, consisting of Jewish and Gentile converts. The Jewish Christians in it were numerous. How then could the Jewish elders at Rome say with truth that they knew little or nothing about the Christian Church and its tenets? Was their knowledge confined to this, 'the sect of the Christians is everywhere spoken against?' Did

they never hear of the disciple of Gamaliel adopting the faith of the new sect and propagating it far and wide among Jews and heathens, till more than twenty years after? The Roman Jews must have been ignorant indeed, if they were not pretty well acquainted with many in the Christian Church. It is incredible that they were so far excluded from intercourse with the world around as not to know something about the Christians in their vicinity, and about that great opponent of Judaism whom his countrymen followed with persevering animosity from place to place.

Apologists resort to conjecture to account for the ignorance of Paul's work which the Jews evince. His persecution, we are told, was a party or Sadducaic measure, neither avowed nor supported by the great body of the Jewish nation; while those who had visited and returned from Jerusalem, being chiefly of the Pharisaic party, were either ignorant or imperfectly informed of the extraordinary adventures of Paul in their native city. Were not the parties among the Jews united in their opposition to the apostle of the Gentiles?

It is idle to suppose that the leading Jews at Rome dissembled on the occasion; or that they employed *an official reserve.* The *official* standpoint which Meyer after Tholuck makes for them, supposing that their words if taken literally may not be false, is a subterfuge. The whole narrative shows that the writer describes their procedure as open. They appointed a day for conversation; and many went to his lodging to learn the sentiments of the sect he represented.

The improbability of the account given of the apostle on his arrival in Rome is strengthened by what he is made to say: 'I have committed nothing against the customs of our fathers' All his energies were directed to the overthrow of the Mosaic institutions, by preaching faith in Christ as a substitute. His feverish anxiety to stand well with his countrymen on the ground of

orthodoxy hardly agrees with the character of one whose Christian point of view was diametrically opposed to the Jewish one. Jews and Judaising Christians alike had shown their animosity against the man whose leading principle was justification by faith without the deeds of the law.[1]

3. The speeches contain ideas unsuitable to the speakers. Sometimes they are arranged in an artificial method, through which we may discover a purpose in harmony with the leading object of the work. Their language is that of the supposed Luke rather than of Peter or Paul. Few critics go so far as to believe that the discourses of the apostles and others are given *verbatim* as they were delivered; or that those thought to be spoken in Aramæan were *literally* translated. It is generally conceded that they are not reported in the identical terms originally employed, but that peculiarities of diction belonging to the author appear in them. The extent to which this freedom reaches is a matter of *degree*. If it can be shown, however, that the speeches exhibit many inappropriate particulars, with a recurrence of the same ideas and modes of expression; that their language is substantially that of the writer, not of the speakers; their general credibility is weakened.

Let us look at the discourses of Peter and Paul. The former addressing the assembled disciples in i. 16–22, calls his own mother tongue and that of his hearers 'their proper tongue,' and supposes that it was strange by adding the explanation of Aceldama in Greek. How could he regard Aramæan as external to his hearers and himself? The context shows that neither the eighteenth and nineteenth verses, nor the latter verse alone, can be a parenthetic explanation of the writer, but must belong to the speech itself. The account of Judas's death also disagrees with that given by Matthew in various particulars Perhaps too Peter would not have put together

[1] Baur's *Paulus der Apostel Jesu Christi*, p. 368, *et seq.*

two separate passages from the Old Testament and regarded them as a direct prophecy of Judas, contrary to the proper interpretation (verse 20).

The next address of Peter in ii. 14–40 contains a Pauline sentiment, that the heathen were embraced in the Divine promise of favour. 'The promise is to you and to your children and *to all that are afar off*, as many as the Lord our God shall call.' We learn from the epistle to the Galatians, that Peter had not such ideas about the admission of the Gentiles to the privileges of Christianity till long after; not till Paul had privately explained the success of his work among them. All that we see of him in the epistle to the Galatians is adverse to the notion that his feelings in favour of a liberal inclusion of the Gentiles were original. His vacillations are unlike one whose mind was early inclined to that view. The machinery of visions and revelations introductory to Cornelius's reception, shows that the writer did not conceive of Peter as a liberal Christian from the beginning, else he would have emphasised his sentiments more clearly in his first speech. The caution which must be attributed to him if his liberal feelings respecting the Gentiles were real—the insinuation of a corollary at the end of his two addresses in a dexterous indirect manner (ii. 39; iii. 26)—are unlike the outspokenness of his character. In speech he was an unskilful tactician. We must therefore hold, contrary to Mr. Lloyd,[1] that liberal ideas in relation to the Gentiles are transferred from Paul to him. The opinion is perhaps admissible that the apostle understood the 16th and 110th Psalms to be direct prophecies of Christ as the Messiah, though that is contrary to historical interpretation; that he took the 110th Psalm as David's composition, which it is not; but his language is very much that of the author of the work.[2]

[1] *Christianity in the Cartoons*, p. 134.

[2] Thus: διὰ χειρῶν (23) occurs in v. 12; xiv. 3; xix. 11; ἄχρι τῆς

Again, in the sayings of Peter, recorded in chapters iii. 12–26 and iv. 9–12, we observe the ideas and phraseology which are characteristic of Luke himself. Great importance is attached to faith, to the exclusion of human agency; and in the phraseology connected with faith lies the first indication of the gospel being designed for the heathen as well as the Jews. παῖς Θεοῦ, applied to Jesus (iii. 13, 26), occurs in iv. 27, 30; also in iv. 25 of David; and διὰ στόματος (iii. 18, 21), is in i. 16; iv. 25; xv. 7; Luke i. 70. χαρίζεσθαι (iii. 14), comp. xxv. 11, 16; Luke vii. 42; ἄχρι (iii. 21); καθεξῆς (iii. 24); σωτηρία (iv. 12); and the construction of the infinitive (iii. 12, 19), show Luke's style. Peter explains the expression *seed* (iii. 25) of Christ, as Paul does in the epistle to the Galatians. It is also improbable that he would have attributed to all the prophets predictions to the effect that the Messiah should suffer in the same way that Jesus did—a suffering Messiah being unknown to the prophets; or that he would have misinterpreted the passage in Deut. xviii. 15, which was not meant for the Messiah, but for some distinguished forerunner. The probability of the latter may be admitted on the part of the apostle; but he could hardly believe in a predicted suffering Messiah of the Old Testament. The passage in the 118th Psalm (iv. 11) is explained as in the epistle to the Romans, ix. 33; and the declaration, 'there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved,' is characteristically Pauline. The language of Luke also appears in what Peter says in v. 29–32; as is evident from κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου v. 30 (comp. x. 39; xiii. 29).

In x. 34–43 the address of Peter is altogether Pauline. The very commencement, 'I perceive that God is no

ἡμέρας ταύτης (29), Acts xxvi. 22; xxiii. 1; τῇ δεξίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑψωθεὶς (33), comp. v. 31; ἐπαγγελία τοῦ πνεύματος (33), comp. i. 4 and Luke xxiv. 49. The words γνωστὸς (14), μνῆμα (29), ἀσφαλῶς (36), are chiefly used by Luke; and ἀσμένως (14) with δέχεσθαι is also in xxi. 17.

respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him,' etc. etc., resembles Paul's 'glory, honour, and peace to every man that worketh good; to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile.' In like manner, the similarity between x. 26 and xiv. 15, x. 42 and xvii. 31, can hardly be accidental. The principles enunciated by Peter in the section are those of Paul; and the conduct of the former in baptizing a heathen is consistent with his sayings. How improbable is it, that he was convinced at this time of the great truth, viz. that the Gentiles were fully entitled to the privileges of Christianity! It was not till Paul had brought that truth plainly under the notice of the leading apostles at Jerusalem by means of his missionary experiences, that Peter, James, and John recognised it. The language is Luke's as before.[1]

The general sentiment deducible from the discourses of Peter, viz. that they betray the mind and style of him who wrote the book, is corroborated by the statement put into the apostle's mouth in xi. 16, viz. that Jesus said, 'John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.' As the same statement is made by Luke himself, Acts i. 5, it is highly probable that the evangelist attributed the words of the Baptist to Jesus incorrectly, for no gospel assigns them to the latter.

Let us now look at Paul's discourses. The first recorded is that at Antioch (xiii. 16–41), the resemblance of which to those of Peter and Stephen is sufficiently obvious. The commencement takes the same historical course as that of Stephen, the leading points in both being the same; the time of the patriarchs, the sojourn of the people in Egypt, and King David (16–22). The second part (23–31) is analogous to the two discourses

[1] Compare Mayerhoff's *Einleitung in die Petrinischen Schriften*, p. 218, *et seq.*

of Peter in the 3rd and 10th chapters. The next paragraph resembles Peter's first discourse (32–37). Like Peter, Paul emphasises the resurrection not the death of Jesus, and uses the 16th Psalm in proof of it. Towards the conclusion, the Pauline doctrine of justification *does* appear (38, 39) ; but instead of putting justification by faith *in place of* justification by the law, he intimates that the former is a complement to the latter, that it furnishes forgiveness for *all* the sins which the Mosaic law could not. The law left justification incomplete. Thus the only passage in Paul's discourses, setting forth his distinguishing doctrine of justification by faith alone, announces it but partially, with a Judaistic tinge that detracts from its true type.

The discourse at Athens (chap. xvii.) is highly artificial in its structure. Its leading object was to place the contrast between Christianity and heathenism in the strongest possible light, so that the former should appear immensely superior to the latter, even in the centre of Hellenic culture. So far, the apostle might have presented the two systems in striking antagonism. But it is not easy to see how he could have proceeded so abruptly to the doctrine of the resurrection—a topic that must have been revolting to his hearers—consistently with the wise adaptation he uniformly practised. He must have known that the idea of a resurrection from the dead would be an effectual barrier to the reception of Christianity on the part of his hearers. The general circumstances have a resemblance to those connected with Stephen's speech. The one was led before the Sanhedrim, the other before the court of the Areopagus. In the one case, the speech takes a sudden turn, which leads to an abrupt termination. The close of both is sudden. The very fact that Paul was taken before the supreme court at Athens, leads to the suspicion that the discourse and its introductory circumstances are merely proofs of the writer's skill. For the

language used by Luke, 'they took him and brought him unto the Areopagus,' 'standing in the midst of the Areopagus,' and his being termed 'a setter forth of strange gods,' implies that he was taken before the court on trial; an idea favoured by the conversion of Dionysius, who was one of the tribunal. The Areopagites had the guardianship of the existing laws, especially those relating to religion. The view of Christ presented in the thirty-first verse is scarcely Pauline. It has indeed a certain analogy to Rom. i. 4, as De Wette observes; but it is still too prosaic and flat for the apostle. 'The man whom God hath ordained, whom he attested to all by raising him from the dead,' is more like the view in ii. 36; iv. 27; x. 38, than the elevated one entertained by the apostle respecting the person of Christ. The suspicion that the mind of Luke appears more than that of Paul is partially sanctioned by the language, as *τανῦν*, verse 30, the paraphrastic participles *ἐπιλαβόμενοι* (19), and *σταθεὶς ἐν μέσῳ* (22), and the expression, 'his spirit was stirred in him' (16); (comp. Luke xxiv. 32; *τί ἂν θέλοι* (18, 20); comp. ii. 12; Luke i. 62;) though none of these phrases, except the first, appears in the speech itself but its surroundings. It must be confessed, however, that the discourse contains many peculiar expressions, there being no less than twenty-six words in 19–34 which do not occur in Luke; a fact explained only in part by the apostle's audience, who were philosophical heathens incapable of understanding or relishing Jewish Christian phraseology. Notwithstanding the difficulties inherent in the whole speech; its want of applicability to the case of the Epicureans and Stoics, and its introduction of the resurrection; we think that it is the speaker's to a considerable extent. It is in harmony with the first epistle to the Thessalonians; and if it be a condensed summary of many addresses, the sentiments and part of the language are probably Paul's. The materials show skilful

distribution though they suffer by undue contraction. The place, the high court, the masters of Athenian wisdom, the partial correspondence of the idea that Jesus and the Anastasis were foreign deities with the accusation against Socrates and the commencing words, show the writer's careful hand.[1]

The address to the Ephesian elders at Miletus must be assigned to the writer more than the speaker, although Neander tries to show that it has been faithfully reported, at least in its essential contents. An apologetic tone pervades it. Instead of a hortatory and didactic element, Paul speaks of himself, setting forth his own conduct among them as marked by self-denial and fidelity. He mentions the dangers that threatened him, to show that he did not fear death in the Lord's service; and after warning them against false teachers, reverts to his disinterested love and perseverance. The apostle's discourse turns principally on himself. Even at the close of it, self is prominent. The hortatory element, which one naturally expects, is subordinate (verses 28, 31). How could he thus recommend his own example instead of Christ's? Was it needful to do so before persons among whom he had laboured for three years? In one respect, that of taking no support from those he taught, he could not intend to set before the Ephesian elders an example for their imitation, because he never required this of other teachers, whether they were itinerant missionaries or overseers of churches. The tenor of the discourse suits a later point of view, betraying one who looked at the apostle with reverential feelings, and believed that his great merits had not found appreciation. It is unlikely that he would say decidedly, 'I *know* that ye all shall see my face no more,' which is

[1] It would seem that some of the Athenian hearers thought *Anastasis* to be a goddess, so that they took Jesus and Anastasis for two new deities. The preaching of the apostle was regarded with irony and contempt (see xvii. 18).

not fully supported by the twenty-second verse, where he declares that he was ignorant of what was to befall him in Jerusalem; nor consistent with xix. 21, where, after purposing to visit Jerusalem, he says, 'After I have been there, I must also see Rome.' The epistle to the Romans also expresses a strong desire to visit their city, and to proceed thence to Spain. Even when he was in Rome, he expected to be released from prison and go to Philippi (Phil. ii. 24). With such hopes of future activity, he could scarcely have expressed to these elders his foreknowledge of their not seeing him again. The mode too in which the false teachers from among themselves are spoken of, corrupters of Christianity after his departure, is unlike the apostle. Nothing definite is stated; no distinct trait is given to identify them; the expressions are general and vague, such as 'speaking perverse things.' All this is natural from a later person referring to earlier things and avoiding anachronism; but it is unnatural in the mouth of the apostle, whose experience of opponents was not new. Why does he not allude to *existing* false teachers, especially as they belonged both to the present and the future? Why not refer to those Judaistic errors which he knew to be so dangerous and persistent? Shall we say with Baumgarten,[1] that as all Gentile ecclesiastical heresy had nothing but a Judaistic form, the apostle thought it sufficient that his hearers were acquainted with the decision of the council at Jerusalem? That does not touch the essence of the question. The false teachers pointed at are the Gnostics, whom a late writer could not name because they did not exist in the apostle's time; neither would it have been appropriate for Paul to speak expressly of them beforehand. As to the alleged marks of authenticity stated by Neander, their weakness is shown by Zeller.[2] The language alone proves that

[1] *Die Apostelgeschichte,* zweiten Theiles zweite Abtheilung, p. 103.

[2] *Die Apostelgeschichte nach ihrem Inhalt und Ursprung kritisch untersucht,* p. 269, *et seq.*

it was partly framed by the author of the Acts, as δημοσίᾳ (20), xvi. 37 ; xviii. 28 ; διαμαρτύρεσθαι (21, 23, 24), ii. 40 ; viii. 25 ; x. 42 ; xviii. 5. etc. ; καὶ νῦν (22, 25), iii. 17 ; vii. 34 ; x. 5 ; xiii. 11 ; xvi. 37, etc. ; τανῦν (32), iv. 29 ; v. 38 ; xvii. 30 ; τελειοῦν τὸν δρόμον (24) ; comp. xiii. 25 ; διέρχεσθαι (25), passim ; νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν (31), xxvi. 7 ; Luke ii. 37 ; παύεσθαι (31), v. 42 ; vi. 13 ; xiii. 10 ; xxi. 32 ; παρατίθεσθαι (32), xiv. 23 ; xvii. 3 ; ὑποδεικνύναι (35), ix. 16 ; ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι (35), Luke i. 54. Several Pauline expressions adduced by Lekebusch [1] prove nothing on the other side, because the writer of the Acts was a Pauline Christian ; and there are indications in the address of its not being entirely fictitious, such as, *the elders* of the Ephesian church being identified with *the bishops*, and the mention of his labouring with his own hands, which appears in 1 Thess. ii. 9 ; 2 Thess. iii. 7–9 ; 1 Cor. iv. 12 ; ix. 12 ; 2 Cor. xi. 8, 9. The writer may have had notes of the speech, which he reproduced and expanded with freedom.

The discourses of Paul in chapters xxii. and xxvi. narrate the circumstances attending his conversion and apostolic call, and are substantially the same as the prior account in the 9th chapter. The three coincide in language and style. All exhibit unhistorical elements, especially the first. The second agrees with the first in making Paul go to Jerusalem to the apostles immediately after his conversion, contrary to the epistle to

[1] δουλεύειν τῷ Κυρίῳ, Θεῷ, or Χριστῷ, Acts xx. 19, six times in Paul, only in Matt. vi. 24, Luke xvi. 13 besides ; ταπεινοφροσύνη xx. 19, five times in Paul, only in 1 Peter v. 5 besides ; ὑποστέλλω xx. 20, Gal. ii. 12; τὸ συμφέρον xx. 20, three times in 1 Cor., only in Hebr. xii. 20 besides ; διακονία xx. 24, twenty-two times in Paul ; μαρτύρομαι Acts xx. 26, Gal. v. 3, Ephes. iv. 17 ; καθαρὸς ἐγώ xx. 26, Acts xviii. 6 ; φείδομαι xx. 29, seven times in Paul, only in 2 Peter ii. 4, 5, besides ; νουθετεῖν xx. 31, seven times in Paul ; ἐποικοδομεῖν xx. 32, six times in Paul, only in Jude 20 besides ; κοπιᾶν, active, xx. 35, thirteen times in Paul ; the hortative γρηγορεῖτε xx. 31, 1 Cor. xvi. 13 ; these may show nothing more than a writer familiar with the Pauline diction, as the author of the Acts undoubtedly was.—*Die Composition und Entstehung der Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 338, 339.

the Galatians, and states that the apostle had a vision of Christ in the temple. The third agrees with the first, in saying that he preached in Jerusalem and Judea soon after his embracing Christianity. Besides xxii. 20 alludes to vii. 58 ; viii. 1 ; and the words which Jesus addresses to Ananias in a vision, in the 9th chapter, are spoken to the apostle himself in a vision (xxii. 21). The expression in xxii. 16, 'be baptized and wash away thy sins,' etc., is inappropriate in the mouth of Ananias at that time.

That the discourses of the book bear the impress of the writer appears still farther from Stephen's address, whose citations of Scripture are not always accurate.

The departure of Abraham, after his father's death, from Haran, is irreconcilable with the dates in Genesis. Abraham quitted Haran when he was 75, i.e. when his father was 145 ; yet his father lived to be 205.

The narrative of Abraham's purchase in Gen. xxiii. disagrees with the statement that he did not possess a foot of the promised land (vii. 5).

The number of Jacob's family which went down to Egypt is said to be 75 (vii. 14), whereas in Genesis it is 70.

All the sons of Jacob are said to have been buried in Palestine (vii. 16), which does not harmonise with Genesis.

Jacob is said to have been buried in Sychem ; according to Genesis, his body was laid in the cave of Machpelah.

Abraham bought a field of the sons of Hamor (vii. 16) ; whereas Jacob bought it (Gen. xxxiii. 19). Abraham bought the cave of Machpelah.

It is stated that Moses was mighty *in words* (vii. 22), which is at variance with Exod. iv. 10.

Instead of Babylon (vii. 43), Amos has Damascus.

Thus the divergences from the Old Testament are numerous. In some of them Stephen probably followed current Jewish traditions. A man of his knowledge and faith could scarcely have made so many historical mistakes; but they might have been owing to the incomplete materials which the writer possessed—materials derived from one who lived near enough the time of the events to furnish a faithful outline of the argument followed by Stephen.

We do not affirm that the speeches to which we have been referring are entirely supposititious in their contents and style. It is enough to maintain, that they evince the hand of him that wrote the whole book. The general writer had at least a share in their production; so that their authenticity can only be held in a qualified sense. The speakers did not utter them as they now are. None are faithful versions of the Aramæan originals in which some were spoken. The speakers themselves did not furnish a faithful copy, neither were they taken down correctly. Criticism disproves the idea that they were really uttered as written, both in substance and words. The unhistorical element is too apparent to allow more than partial authenticity. Contents, order, and language evince the writer as well as the speaker.

We are reminded, however, that the discourses of Peter resemble one another, and have so much internal likeness as to show their origin in the same person. Not only their ideas, but even their phrases and modes of expression, it is said, are similar, and analogous to the recognised peculiarities of Peter in his first epistle. The following are given: ἐλάλησε ὁ Θεὸς or προφήτης ii. 31; iii. 21, 24; but this is in Luke i. 55. μετανοήσατε καὶ ἐπιστρέψατε iii. 19; but the same combination appears in xxvi. 20. διὰ στόματος τῶν προφητῶν iii. 18, 21; but this occurs in Luke i. 70; and in iv. 25 a similar expression employed by the writer has its

parallel in Peter's address i. 16. νῦν οἶδα ὅτι iii. 17; with ἀληθῶς after οἶδα xii. 11. The fact that the two last differ in expression; and the use of οἶδα ὅτι in Paul's speeches in the Acts as also in the gospel, neutralise this. Jesus was delivered up τῇ ὡρισμένῃ βουλῇ ii. 23; comp. iv. 28; x. 42. The same idea is in Luke xxii. 22 expressed by the same verb in the participle. Jesus is called *the servant of God*, παῖς Θεοῦ, iii. 13, 26; iv. 27, 30. The idea that while the Jews believed they had destroyed Jesus they had been instrumental in exalting him to glory, recurs in Peter's addresses, ii. 23, etc.; iii. 13, etc.; v. 30; x. 39. Compare with the passages that express the idea of Jesus suffering by the determinate counsel of God, 1 Peter i. 2, 20; ii. 4, 6. The antithesis between the purpose of the Jews to destroy the Redeemer and his glorious resurrection occurs in 1 Peter i. 19, etc. But the same idea is in xiii. 27, etc. Psalm cxviii. 22 is quoted only in Acts iv. 11 and 1 Peter ii. 7, where it is applied to Christ. Such are the strongest coincidences in Peter's speeches adduced by Ebrard;[1] but they are not all valid, as we have seen. Weiss has followed the same line of argument, with no better success, as Overbeck shows. The language of Peter's discourses cannot be divested of the general impress belonging to the book; and their contents justify whatever is unusual. The non-authenticity of the first epistle which passes under Peter's name, nullifies any argument derived from its resemblance to the speeches—a resemblance that is only superficial.

With respect to Paul's discourses also, we are reminded that the same ideas are repeated in them; that similar phrases, constructions, and modes of connecting sentences, recur. This is natural. That the apostle should express himself after the same manner on different occasions was to be expected. But the similarity

[1] *Wissenschaftliche Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte*, p. 889, *et seq.*

in question is as favourable to the assumption that the author of the Acts put the ideas and words into his mouth, as it is to the literal authenticity of the speeches. It is even more so, unless it appear that the phraseology of Paul is distinctively separated from the writer's. The likeness of style and linguistic peculiarities between the discourses of the apostle and the narratives of Luke is greater than that between the discourses and the Pauline epistles. Thus in the apostle's apology before the Jews xxii. 1–32, not a single expression peculiarly Pauline occurs. The whole is in Luke's manner, so much so that various words employed by the evangelist alone are found here, as *συνεῖναι*, *αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ*, *εὐλαβὴς*, etc. So too, the discourse before Felix, xxiv. 10–21, is impregnated with Luke's manner, the words *ἁγνίζεσθαι*, *ἑστώς*, etc. clearly pointing to his pen. The defence before Agrippa is confidently appealed to, to show its verbal authenticity, because it is said to be full of Paul's peculiar expressions.[1] But the list needs sifting. *διό* is a genuine expression of Luke's, since it occurs twice in his gospel and ten times in the Acts. The verb *προγινώσκειν* is found but twice in the epistle to the Romans, and is not peculiarly Pauline. *θρησκεία* occurs but once in the epistle to the Colossians, so that it is not Pauline. On the contrary, it is found twice in the epistle of James. *νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν* is found in the Acts elsewhere, as also in Luke's gospel, but not in Paul's writings. *καταντῆσαι* with *εἰς* belongs much more to Luke than Paul, for it occurs eight or nine times in the Acts, and only four times in the epistles to the Corinthians, Philippians, and Ephesians. *κρίνεται παρ' ὑμῖν* never occurs in Paul. *ἔδοξα* is unknown to Paul. *ἐναντία* is not characteristic of the

[1] As *ἥγημαι*, *διό*, *προγινώσκοντες*, *θρησκεία*, *ἐπ' ἐλπίδι*, *κ.τ.λ.*, *νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν*, *καταντῆσαι*, *κρίνεται παρ' ὑμῖν*, *ἔδοξα*, *ἐναντία*, *τῶν ἁγίων*, *τιμωρῶν*, *τὰς ἔξω πόλεις*, *ὑπὲρ τὴν λαμπρότητα*, *κλῆρον ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις*, *μετανοεῖν* abs., *ἐκτός*, *πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως*, *σωφροσύνη*, *ἐν ὀλίγῳ*, *ὁποῖος*, *παρεκτός*.

apostle any more than of Luke. τιμωρεῖν is only found in Acts xxii. 5 besides, and cannot be pronounced Pauline. ὑπέρ followed by the accusative is found twice in Luke's gospel. κλῆρον ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις never occurs in Paul; but there is a similar expression in the Colossian epistle. μετανοεῖν absol. is found both in the third gospel and Acts, but never in Paul. πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως is not found in Paul. The idea is otherwise expressed. σωφροσύνη occurs twice in the first epistle to Timothy but not in Paul's authentic epistles. ἐν ὀλίγῳ is not Pauline; it occurs but once in Ephesians and then in a different sense. The apostle uses ὁποῖος but twice. Hence it is not one of his characteristic words. παρεκτός is never used by him as a preposition. He employs it once only as an adverb. After these remarks the reader will judge of the truth of such statements as the speech 'is full of Paul's manner.' On the contrary, it shows the hand of Luke throughout.[1]

That the speeches were not uttered as they are written either in substance or in words, may be inferred from the fact that they exhibit a recurrence of the same ideas and turns of expression, as in ii. 25, etc. comp. xiii. 34: ii. 39, iii. 25, etc. comp. xiii. 26: iii. 18, comp. xiii. 27: iii. 17, etc. comp. xvii. 30: v. 20, comp. xiii. 26: x. 40 comp. xvii. 31: i. 8, 22; ii. 32; iii. 15; v. 32; x. 39, 41, comp. xiii. 31: i. 10, 16, ii. 14, 22, iii. 12, v. 35, vii. 2, xiii. 16, 26, xvii. 22, xxii. 1. The Old Testament is everywhere quoted from the Septuagint and applied in a method contrary to historical interpretation. Even when that translation is opposed to the original it is followed, as in xv. 16, 17, where James uses the version to show that Amos prophesied of the conversion of the Gentiles; whereas the prophet speaks of the Jews conquering the remnant of Edom and incorporating them with themselves, as fellow-worshippers in the Messianic

[1] In ἐν φυλακαῖς κατέκλεισα, ἀναιρουμένων, περιλάμψαν, καταπεσόντων, συλλαβόμενοι, διαχειρίσασθαι, ἀποφθέγγομαι.

age. We are reminded however by Trip, that a thorough comparison of the discourses scattered throughout the Acts with the Pauline epistles cannot be instituted, because they were addressed to different persons. Paul wrote to Christians, Gentile and Jewish, who had been already instructed; he spoke to Jews or Gentiles, or both, who had no previous knowledge of the new religion. The only exception to this is the address to the Ephesian elders at Miletus. It is also alleged for the purpose of neutralising any effects of comparison unfavourable to the authenticity of the discourses in the Acts, that writing and speaking are different things. Agreeing in the same object, their method of reaching it cannot be the same. And thirdly, it should not be forgotten that the epistles were either written or dictated by Paul himself, so that their contents are perspicuously arranged and often developed at length; while the discourses in the Acts were written down by another who, with all his care, could not reproduce them as accurately or perfectly as they were spoken. None of these considerations, nor all together, prevent a fair inference from the comparison in question. The fact that the address at Miletus to the Ephesians is of the same character as the rest, shows that the nature of the audience does not change the topics insisted on. Besides, in addressing Jews at Antioch, we meet with the only passage in which the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith appears, and even there in an imperfect manner (Acts xiii. 38, 39). Had this passage been in the speech to the elders of Ephesus, the difference of persons might have been supposed of importance in varying the nature of Paul's preaching; as it is not, we infer that the leading doctrines on which the apostle insisted were always similar. His mind was so strongly penetrated with a few central ideas to which he attached paramount importance, that he could scarcely have refrained from their inculcation. In this view, they

were of equal moment to Jew and Gentile. As to speaking and writing, they affect the manner, not the substance of doctrine; and the latter is the point in debate. The same applies to their being written by Paul himself or another. If that other did not only put them into different language and shape but altered their character, he would be giving forth his own ideas, not those of him whom he professed to report. Besides, perspicuous order and skilful arrangement are more apparent in the discourses of the Acts than in the Pauline epistles. None of the circumstances alleged by apologists avail to counterbalance the different type of teaching presented by Paul the speaker and Paul the letter-writer.

That the speeches were largely composed by the writer of the Acts, is also evident from their containing unhistorical and unsuitable particulars. How could Peter declare it *unlawful* for a Jew to keep company with and come in to one of another nation (x. 28)? Suppose it were so in the case of idolaters, how could it be the same with relation to persons called *devout*, like Cornelius? Even the stricter Jews could hardly have avoided intercourse with these persons, else they could have made no efforts for their conversion. There is little doubt that Cornelius was a heathen; and though eating with heathens was against the Mosaic law, other intercourse with them was allowed. It is improbable that any prohibition existed against such association with an uncircumcised heathen like Cornelius; and Peter could not have used the language attributed to him. In like manner, the statement of Gamaliel about Theudas is inaccurate and does not proceed from the speaker (v. 36). The insurrectionist of that name appeared in the reign of Claudius, about ten years after the delivery of the speech; as we learn from Josephus, whose description agrees exactly, sometimes even verbally, with the notice of Theudas in the Acts, so that no other could have

been meant. The anachronism belongs to the writer of the book.

The speeches should not be considered the free composition of the writer *altogether*. As he used sources oral and written, he had information from without. But the nature of the speeches necessitates the conclusion that they received part of their substance and most of their form from the narrator.

4. The character of the discourses leads us to infer that the narratives with which they are connected are partly unhistorical. Besides several contradictions into which the writer falls, such as, that Paul's companions on his way to Damascus 'heard the voice of Christ' (Acts ix. 7), and also did *not* hear it (Acts xxii. 9), words that do not mean 'they did not *understand* the voice;' the accounts are interspersed with much that is incredible. We have seen that the description of the Pentecostal effusion of the Spirit cannot be sustained in its natural sense, and is even unsupported by Peter, who takes Paul's view of the tongues, when he refers the hearers to the time of the day in proof that the assembled Christians were not intoxicated, instead of appealing to the new languages which the strangers would have known.

The description of the primitive believers at Jerusalem is partly ideal. The writer states that they had a community of goods. 'All that believed had all things common, and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men as every man had need.' A small part of the people only could have done so. The author gives an enthusiastic view of these early Christians, some of whom may probably have acted as is described, under the influence of fanatical notions about the immediate establishment of the divine kingdom on earth.

As to the death of Ananias and Sapphira, it is set forth as the miraculous, instantaneous effect of Peter's

words. This, with the harshness of the divinely inflicted punishment, which is out of character with the spirit of the gospel, prevents the critic from accepting the fact as historical.

The healing of the lame man at the gate of the temple, effected by the wonder-working word of Peter in a moment, and without any condition of faith in the subject, must be classed with miracles in general. If the interpreter believe that the ordinary laws of nature established by God may be superseded, interfered with, altered at times by the will of Him who ordained them; or if he refer such cases to the operation of unseen but higher laws than those working around and within us, he will find no insuperable difficulty in accepting the statements of them as credible. If he hold that the Supreme Being knew the efficiency of the laws which He established at first, and foresaw all the effects to which they were adequate, he will resolve them into the myths of after times. The book of the Acts is impregnated with the miraculous. It even states that sick persons were brought forth into the streets and laid on couches, in the belief that they might be cured by the shadow of Peter; and a parallel instance is related of Paul, that handkerchiefs or aprons which had touched his body received from it a magic power to heal diseases and expel demons. Such extravagances of the miraculous element may readily lead a reader to reject it.

The account of the apostles being supernaturally delivered, brought forth from prison, and commanded to speak boldly in the temple, is suspicious (v.). The liberated are imprisoned again, so that the miracle is so far frustrated. Nor do the Sanhedrim make the least allusion to the supernatural event, or inquire into its truth.

As to the speech of Gamaliel, we have already seen an error in it which such a person would hardly commit; and therefore the whole of what he said may be ficti-

tious. He belonged undoubtedly to the Pharisees ; the party which had condemned Jesus to death not long before. Did this zealous adherent of the law become the protector of the early Christians ? Did he advise and persuade his fellow-members of the Sanhedrim to let the new heresy alone ? If he did, his authority was thenceforward gone ; and we know it was not. Were the antipathies of the party changed so soon after the crucifixion of Jesus ? This is improbable. And it is equally so that the Sadducees had taken their place as the persecutors of the Christians (iv. 1, 2). It is even said that the high-priest Annas was at the head of the Sadducean party (v. 17), which we know to be incorrect from the gospels and Josephus, who remarks that his son Annas that succeeded him was a Sadducee, distinguishing him from his father in that respect.[1] This is contrary to the view of Keim, who thinks that the gospels in making him a Pharisee should be corrected by the Acts.[2] Thus we are led to regard the whole narrative respecting the favour shown by Gamaliel to the apostles as unhistorical. He was a believer in the resurrection, while the Sadducees were not ; and as the resurrection of Jesus is the central point of the apostle's doctrine, the orthodox Jews are on the side of the Christians, while the heterodox persecute them. Thus the writer had an object in making Annas a Sadducee, and Gamaliel the Pharisee a friend of the persecuted.

The 6th chapter containing an account of the election of deacons and of Stephen is historical. In the account of the first martyr there are indeed various legendary elements, while his speech is in part the free composition of the writer ; but he was doubtless accused and put to death by the Jews. His murder seems to have been violent and illegal. The narrative serves as an introduction to that of Paul, whose conversion took

[1] See *Antiqq.* xx. 9, 1. [2] See Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexicon*, vol. i. p. 135.

place in the succession of events following Stephen's death.

The general persecution arising upon the death of Stephen can hardly have driven away *all* the Christians from Jerusalem except the apostles, as stated in viii. 1. A storm bursting upon the disciples would fall first and most severely upon their leaders. Schleiermacher is therefore correct in supposing that the phrase, 'except the apostles,' is unhistorical, being inserted for the sake of the history of Philip; and Baumgarten's attempted explanation is far-fetched. Lekebusch himself admits that the language is hyperbolical; but asks why they should have fled with the rest; to which we answer, because of their Master's advice: 'When they persecute you in this city flee ye into another.' Not long after, disciples were at Jerusalem (ix. 26), all of whom could not have been new members. Probably Hellenistic Jews only who had attached themselves to Stephen were obliged to flee from the metropolis (xi. 19, 20).

The spread of Christianity in Samaria by Philip and his baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch appear to be historical. But the narrative contains improbable elements, such as the mission of Peter and John to Samaria to impart the Holy Ghost to the converts there. The belief that none but an apostle had this magic power lies at the basis of the statement. The narrative respecting Simon the sorcerer magnifies Peter and is full of incongruous particulars; though we cannot hold the sorcerer to be an imaginary person.

The conversion of Saul is a historical fact, and the description of it in the 9th chapter substantially true. That it is not correct in all particulars may be inferred from the variations in the parallel narratives (xxii., xxvi.). According to the 9th chapter, Paul fell to the earth and heard a voice addressing him, while his companions stood speechless; but in xxvi. 14, both he and they are said to have fallen to the ground. Again, in

ix. 7 it is stated that they *heard* the voice but *saw* no one; whereas in xxii. 9 they *saw* the light but did *not* hear the voice. Still farther, some of the words spoken by Jesus to Paul in xxvi. 16–18 are addressed to Ananias in ix. 15; and in xxii. 15, 21, they are partly spoken by Ananias, partly by Jesus appearing to the apostle a second time. The statement in xxvi. 14, 15, etc. of the words spoken by Jesus disagrees with that given both in the 9th and the 22nd chapters, which is shorter. These minor and irreconcilable differences create suspicion against the perfect credibility of the narrative. The reader, far from seeing in them a convincing proof of its simple truth, as if inaccuracy in reporting details certified accuracy in the main points, will probably infer the lapse of some time between the historian and the events he records. It is best to regard Paul's conversion as an inward operation; a spiritual revelation of Christ to the higher consciousness. The great crisis of his earthly life—his thorough and final conversion—had come. Former meditations, above all the discourse and death of Stephen, had prepared him for the consummation. The first Christian martyr facilitated the inward process of a mind far greater than his, in reaching an intense conviction of the Christian faith. The phenomena were subjective not objective. The apostle's consciousness of the divine found partial expression in external circumstances. In any case he believed the fact that he had seen Christ; and though psychology cannot account for the revolution that took place within him, it is as unnecessary as it is unphilosophical to assume that all the phenomena described as external were really so. His soul was ultimately determined to a new career by an unusual spiritual influence, which may be termed 'a revelation of the glorified Jesus speaking to him.' It is not said that he saw the glorified person of Jesus; he saw the splendour or shekinah surrounding him. The narratives imply that Christ

was veiled or screened by the bright light, while present in and encompassed by it ; but they do not state exactly that his person was visible. Seeing the splendour, however, is identified with seeing Jesus himself, since Ananias uses the words, 'that thou *shouldest see* that Just One' (xxii. 14) ; and Barnabas told the disciples at Jerusalem that Paul '*had seen* the Lord' (ix. 27). His own statement also is, that 'he had seen Jesus Christ' (1 Cor. ix. 1 ; xv. 8), referring to the occasion of his conversion. If Paul could not always distinguish whether he was in a state of ecstasy or not, as he says in 2 Cor. xii. 2, it is quite possible he may not have distinguished the vivid intuitions of his inner consciousness from their outward representations. Persons of certain temperaments are predisposed to visions. Bodies of feeble and highly nervous organisation, in which strong spirits are lodged, or those subject to maladies of the epileptic kind, are apt to be overpowered by their impassioned souls, which have vivid perceptions of the invisible ; and spiritual consciousness embodying itself in ideas of sensible objects, assumes the image of reality.

Parallels to the vision of Paul are not wanting. In the life of Ignatius Loyola we are informed that the blessed Virgin appeared to him one night, holding little Jesus in her arms. The apparition lasted a considerable time, and during it, it seemed to him that his heart was purified within him.[1] One day there was represented to him the mystery of the Holy Trinity ; 'a vision that sensibly affected him.' In Doddridge's 'Life of Colonel Gardiner' it is related, that one night an unusual blaze of light fell on the book the Colonel was reading ; and lifting up his eyes he apprehended there was before him, as it were, suspended in the air, a visible representation of the Lord Jesus Christ on the cross,

[1] *Life of St. Ignatius Loyola,* by Bouhours, translated into English. London, 1686, pp. 14, 15.

surrounded with a glory, and he was impressed as if a voice had addressed certain words to him. He was not certain whether it was before his bodily eyes or in the mind, but was certain of its being a vision.

Was this revelation of the glorified Jesus to Paul self-illusion? Not in the ordinary meaning of the word. In a high sense it may be called so—but a sense exemplified by some of the noblest spirits which have exercised a lasting influence on mankind; a sense where intense conviction of spiritual reality is transmuted into a single passion that rules the man thenceforward. An elevated consciousness of the divine asserting itself strongly, has as much reality as the immediate perceptions of sense, and is more directly attributable to God. In any case, the inward fact is the chief thing; external embodiments or accompaniments are of less consequence. The truth of Christianity does not depend on external evidence but on a moral and subjective basis. The apostle's mental revolution was so real that it has affected the world's conception of Christianity. The blindness of Paul and the manner of its removal are mythical or symbolic. It is impossible to take the whole narration as a literal record of what occurred, without violating the philosophy of interpretation.

Peter's baptism of Cornelius, according to which that apostle is the first to introduce the Gentiles to the privileges of Christianity, is unhistorical. We have already seen that he utters Pauline sentiments, more liberal in their tendency than his character would warrant; and here he plays a distinguished part in relation to the heathen. As an introduction to his intercourse with Cornelius, he performs two miracles—the cure of Eneas at Lydda, and the restoration to life of Tabitha at Joppa. The latter resembles Mark's narration of the raising of Jairus's daughter so closely, that it seems to have been moulded after it. The circumstances are dramatically told. The weeping widows of the church

stand by the dead body when the apostle goes into the upper room, and enhance the deceased's merits by displaying the dresses she had made. The miracle itself, the opening of the eyes and sitting up of the dead, Peter's giving her his hand and lifting her up, his calling the saints and widows and presenting her to them—these and similar traits make the description vivid, but show a reflectiveness savouring of an author later than any contemporary one. At the same time, the effect of the miracle is not so great as that which followed the cure of Eneas at Lydda; for 'whereas *many* believed on the Lord' at Joppa, '*all* that dwelt at Lydda and Saron saw Eneas and turned to the Lord,' which is evidently hyperbolical. The visions and marvels introductory to the baptism of Cornelius are numerous enough to awaken suspicion. He saw in a vision an angel coming to him, telling him to send for Peter at Joppa. The next day Peter himself fell into a trance and had a symbolical vision; after this 'the Spirit' told him about the three messengers who were seeking him. When Peter had spoken to Cornelius and his party, there was an outpouring of the Holy Spirit imparting the gift of speaking in tongues. All these wonders, which seem to have been wrought for the enlightenment of the apostle's mind, not for Cornelius who could have learned the principles of Christianity from Philip in Cæsarea, are brought together to inaugurate the baptism of the first heathen. The conduct and sentiments of Peter disagree with his subsequent conduct at Antioch. All that can be maintained as historical is, that the apostle baptized a proselyte of the name of Cornelius, at this early period; not that he baptized a Gentile centurion prior to the council at Jerusalem. The simple fact is dressed out with the miraculous element to enhance its importance in connection with Peter's person.

The deliverance of this apostle from prison, into

which he had been cast by Herod Agrippa, is circumstantially related. Though he was strictly guarded, yet the angel of the Lord brought him forth the very night before his intended execution, and after conducting him through one street suddenly disappeared. The iron gate leading to the city opened of its own accord. The chains with which he had been bound to two soldiers, fell off his hands as soon as the angel, smiting him on the side, awoke him from sleep, and told him what to do. The circumstances are narrated with graphic effect. How the keepers could have allowed the prisoner to escape from between their hands, is not stated; but we are led to suppose that they were in unconscious sleep. The basis of the story is some unexpected deliverance of the apostle, which was afterwards clothed in a mythical dress. Paul's encounter with Elymas the sorcerer, in Paphos, is similar to Peter's with Simon Magus. The punishment inflicted upon him resembles Paul's own blindness at the time of conversion; and thus the occurrence is fictitious.

The cure of a lame man at Lystra is so like a cure performed by Peter, that it seems modelled probably after it. The very language employed by the writer, in both cases, is alike. The effect of the miracle on the people of the place, the worship offered, the sacrifices almost performed to Paul and Barnabas, appear to be as unhistorical as the miracle itself. That the former was stoned, he himself attests in the second epistle to the Corinthians, but without specifying Lystra as the place.

The visit of Paul to Jerusalem, narrated in the 15th chapter, must be identical with that referred to in the 2nd chapter of the Galatian letter. The difference of their character and object has been already indicated. The position of Paul with respect to the three apostles, Peter, James, and John, is not the same as that which is asserted in the epistle to the Galatians. There he

insists on his independence; here he stands in a subordinate relation to the pillars of the metropolitan church. There he is conscious of a divine revelation making him an apostle to the Gentiles; here he consents to be an official delegate of the church at Antioch to the church at Jerusalem, respecting the necessity of circumcision to the converts from heathenism. Here a formal assembly, expressing its sentiments in an apostolic decree, appears. Peter and James utter liberal sentiments, and Paul afterwards circumcises Timothy, agreeably to that decree. That the great apostle could have assented to the resolutions passed at the meeting without opposition is unlikely, when we see that one of the prohibitions at least, that of abstaining from meats offered to idols, is looked upon as conditional in the first epistle to the Corinthians; where the apostle recommends abstinence from such food, solely if it should offend weaker brethren; whereas the decree of the council forbids it absolutely. It is one of the *necessary* things connected with the soul's health. The prohibition of fornication along with things not sinful *per se* but deriving their character from positive law, is also strange. The association of an immoral act with such practices, places it on a level with them. It cannot be intended as an ethical precept of universal obligation, else the mention of it here would be needless. It must therefore be like the rest, a thing arising from complete renunciation of the law of Moses; as likely to result from it as the eating of flesh offered to idols. If such be the light in which the heads of the Jerusalem Church exhibited fornication, it would surely have called forth the animadversions of Paul, who could hardly have allowed the principle of freedom from the law, which he preached, to be reproached with that natural consequence. In addition to other particulars, there is a similarity of construction between the prologue of Luke's gospel and the epistle sent from Jerusalem, which strengthens

the suspicious circumstances.[1] That the apostle visited Jerusalem is certain ; but the narrative is partly unhistorical, because disagreeing with the statements of the Galatian epistle and with the well-attested conduct of Paul on other occasions. A formal assembly, speeches, resolutions written and binding, with most of the attendant circumstances—all that is not contained in Gal. ii.—proceed from the writer himself. While a historical fact forms the basis of the narrative, the author, following perhaps some later traditions and his general plan, has given a picture mostly fictitious. The resolutions of the assembly clash with Paul's fundamental doctrine of justification by faith, and could not have been accepted by him. It is possible that the practices set forth may have existed in some Gentile congregations not under Paul's influence ; but he could not have sanctioned them at the bidding of the mother church in Jerusalem. The transaction to which much importance is attached and which occupies a central section of the book, betrays the writer's free invention, and subserves the object he had in view.

The author of the Acts does not set forth the decrees of the council as 'the recommendation of a single synod, addressed to a particular district, and possessing only a temporary validity ;' he intimates their binding purport in relation to the Gentile churches generally. Paul and Timothy, as they went through the cities of different countries, 'delivered them the decrees for to keep that were ordained of the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem. And so were the churches established in the faith,' etc. (xvi. 4, 5).

The cause of the imprisonment of Paul and Silas at

[1]

Acts xv. 24, 25.	Luke i. 1.
ἐπειδὴ ἠκούσαμεν ὅτι τινὲς ἐτάραξαν . . .	ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι . . .
ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν γενομένοις ὁμοθυμαδόν,	ἔδοξε κἀμοί, παρηκολουθηκότι πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς,
ἄνδρας πέμψαι.	καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι.

Philippi, and the particulars connected with their deliverance, cannot be historical. How could an earthquake have shaken the fetters off all the prisoners? Could the jailor, seeing the prison doors open, think at once of committing suicide, contrary to conscious innocence? How could Paul know, in the darkness of the inner prison, that the captives were all present? Did none of them think of escaping? Did the jailor know at once that the earthquake occurred for the sake of Paul and Silas? Did he venture to set the two free on his own responsibility? The miracle was uncalled for, because the Roman duumvirs released Paul and Silas in the morning. Indeed the authorities themselves treated them illegally and brutally, since they beat and imprisoned them before trial, though one at least was a Roman citizen. Could not the apostle have prevented such treatment at first, by asserting his rights? Why should the jailor have been charged to keep the prisoners in close confinement? The jailor's conduct throughout, his sudden conversion and baptism, the entreaty of the magistrates that they should depart from the city in the morning, all heighten the story, making the deliverance not only more remarkable, but honourable to Paul. The miracle and its accompaniments are unhistorical; but there is no reason for denying the imprisonment and speedy liberation of the apostle and his companion by the authorities. The rest proceeds from the writer himself.

The occurrences at Thessalonica and Berœa are real and credible. At Athens the apostle was taken before the tribunal of the Areopagus, and his speech is given. The nature and course of the speech, its language and purport, have been noticed before. The 18th chapter calls for no particular remark, except that the Nazarite vow, agreeably to which Paul shaved his head at Cenchrea, appears to be imaginary. The 19th chapter, which speaks of the apostle at Ephesus, has several

things difficult to understand. Here he met with disciples of John the Baptist, who, though believers in Christ, had not been baptized in the name of Jesus or heard of the Holy Spirit. Yet Apollos, also a disciple of John, 'taught accurately the things of the Lord,' while he knew nothing of Christian baptism. It is impossible to arrive at a consistent or definite idea of these persons. They were Christians, for they are termed *disciples*; yet, properly speaking, they were not Christians, as they did not know that the coming One had arrived. Their ignorance of the Holy Spirit is remarkable; for even as Jews they must have known his existence. Paul baptized them again. Nothing is said of Apollos's re-baptism. After the apostle laid his hands on them, they spake with tongues and prophesied. Here is the key to the introduction of these John-disciples. At the baptism of Cornelius by Peter, the Holy Ghost fell on that convert and the Gentiles present with him, *and they spake with tongues*. In like manner Paul, to show that he was not behind Peter in this apostolic qualification, conferred the gift of tongues on these disciples by the imposition of hands. The encounter with the exorcists and the mighty effects that followed, the burning of the magical books, are particulars that may be true; but the way in which they are related and the purpose they are intended to serve, awaken doubts. Ephesus was the seat of a heathen magic, which proceeded from the mystic worship of Artemis. Jewish magic also endeavoured to find an abode there, by connecting itself with the heathen. The wonderful power of the apostle over both must be shown. Hence demons are expelled and mystic books burned. The apostle confirms the gospel by miracles. Articles that touched his body have healing power. There is a marked contrast between Ephesian culture and Christianity; the latter overwhelming the former. Heathen and Jewish magic are overcome by the wonder-working efficacy of the apostle.

A tumult raised by Demetrius having compelled Paul to leave Ephesus, he visits various places, and restores Eutychus to life at Troas. The address at Miletus to the Ephesian elders, has been already referred to; and the account of his journey to Jerusalem presents no doubtful particulars. When he comes to the metropolis, James advises him to conciliate the Jewish believers by taking part in a Nazarite offering in the temple, which he does accordingly. 'The reader is shocked,' says the Duke of Somerset, 'at the conduct here ascribed in the Acts to St. Paul. If he turns to the "Horæ Paulinæ," he is shocked at the defence suggested by Paley. This apologist for St. Paul admits that this incident in the history is perplexing. He cannot deny that the Apostle had proclaimed the abrogation of the law even for Jews themselves, but he ventures to hint that Paul complied upon this occasion with the Jewish law from a love of tranquillity or an unwillingness to give offence! The life and labours of the apostle might have exempted him from such an imputation.'[1] If Paul did engage in the transaction, the motive and object differed from those stated in the text. It may be that he was seized by the Jews in the temple, to which he had gone for some other purpose than the one stated. As to his being allowed by the Roman commander to speak to the multitude from the stairs of the castle, the credibility of the thing is doubtful; and the character of the discourse strengthens the doubt, because the writer of the Acts appears in it as well as Paul.

The speech before the Sanhedrim is said to have been interrupted at its very commencement by an unwarrantable act of the high-priest. The words spoken by the apostle on this occasion, '*I wist not*, brethren, that he was the high-priest,' etc., are very strange from one educated as a Jew, who must have known that none but

[1] *Christian Theology and Modern Scepticism*, pp. 80, 81.

the high-priest presided in the Sanhedrim. All shifts to evade the plain meaning are of no avail, such as, 'I did not consider,' as if he had used a hasty expression and immediately corrected himself; since the verb has not that meaning. It is stated that *he looked steadfastly* at the council; an expression excluding the idea of his not knowing the high-priest to all but those who convert it into a steadfast look connected with infirmity of sight, which caused him *not* to distinguish the high-priest! The version, 'I wist not that there was a high-priest,' which disagrees with the following words, is another evasion of the sense, less flagrant than that which construes a *steadfast look* into *not seeing.* The conduct attributed to the apostle, by which he availed himself of a device to produce division in the assembly and thereby defeat his enemies, is not what his known character would lead us to expect. *In the circumstances*, it borders on hypocrisy to call himself a Pharisee. The effects too of the stratagem are surprising. The Pharisees suddenly take his side, forgetting the most objectionable part of his belief, the denial of the authority of the law. The very next day, however, after the Pharisees said, 'we find no evil in this man,' the chief priests and elders, the majority of whom were of that party, are privy to a conspiracy against his life, and soon present a formal accusation against him before Felix.

The narratives in the 24th, 25th, and 26th chapters are historical in substance. Various minor particulars have probably been inserted in the 26th chapter by the writer himself.

The description of the voyage and shipwreck of Paul on his way to Rome is minute and accurate, proceeding from an eyewitness. A few notices here and there betray a later hand, especially those which are framed to show the wonder-working power of the apostle, such as xxviii. 3–5, 8, 9. The proceedings at Rome, as has been already noticed, present both the Jews and the

apostle in a light that cannot be accepted as real, though it consists with the general purpose of the book.

If the preceding observations be correct, the history in the Acts of the Apostles is but partially authentic. Tested by Paul's own epistles and other parts of the New Testament, it has not valid evidence of entire credibility. Even where the means of comparison with authentic statements are wanting and we have only historical criticism to rely upon, the credibility is often doubtful. There is a basis of fact strong enough to show that the little band of primitive believers at Jerusalem increased with great rapidity; that their faith was at once simple and enthusiastic; and that they were closely united till the Jews scattered their ranks by persecution, and were thus unconscious instruments in diffusing the seed of the word throughout Judea. The prominent figure of Stephen, whose liberalism pointed to the radical separation of Christianity from Judaism, and his violent death, serve to introduce Paul. But before the great apostle takes his place as the central figure round whom the history is grouped, Peter's labours are noticed at some length. After this the apostle of the Gentiles is delineated; and though many particulars respecting him cannot be accepted as historical, enough remains to set forth a man who carried the gospel to the Gentiles with a full perception of their right to all its privileges; who travelled from country to country, with untiring zeal, to promote the highest interests of humanity; hastening towards Rome, the metropolis of the heathen world, to plant there the imperishable principles for which his life was in constant peril. Anxious to spread Christianity in Europe, he succeeded in founding churches here and there, till he reached the imperial city then mistress of the world. The missionary labours of the apostle and his companions are not discredited by historical criticism, which merely strips off some of the legendary halo with which they are encompassed. In doing so it takes nothing

from the dignity, the nobleness, the independence, the spiritual intuition and breadth of the apostle; it rather enhances them by making him less of a Jew, less temporising, more occupied with one great idea, the adaptation of Christianity to all men by its inculcation of justifying faith without the deeds of the law.

SOURCES.

The author drew from sources oral and written; how much cannot be ascertained. The following phenomena indicate their employment.

1. The use of the first person plural *we* in xvi. 10–17; xx. 4–15; xxi. 1–18; xxvii. 1–xxviii. 16. The *we*-source appears only in fragments in the sections referred to; and cannot be constructed in its entirety out of them. Its prevailing character was that of an *itinerary*; from which the author excepted freely, using and dropping it according to the general plan of his work. It was much fuller than the sections taken from it would suggest at first sight; and these were worked up methodically. Various particulars are so improbable that they could not have been written by an eyewitness, such as xvi. 16, 17. The writer of the Acts dealt with the source so as to assimilate its materials to the rest of his work, the portions taken from it being characterised by a circumstantiality of detail, a vividness of description, an exact knowledge of localities, an acquaintance with the phrases and habits of seamen, which betray one who was personally present. It has also peculiar constructions and phrases distinguishing it from other parts of the Acts and the third gospel, along with various new words.[1]

2. We cannot trace the use of written sources in other cases, with much success. The places which suggest their employment may be explained on the ground

[1] See Holtzmann, in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift* for 1881, p. 408, etc.

of *unwritten* tradition, though the author lived so long after the persons and events he describes, that there is still a presumption in favour of documents. If this be allowed, however, they are so incorporated with the author's own that it is difficult to pick them out. He used them freely in aid of his general purpose, modifying and altering their contents. The portions that have most appearance of being founded on older sources are the Petrine narratives (ch. i.–v., ix. 31—xi. 18 ; xii. 1–33), and the section about Simon the sorcerer (viii. 9–24). It is not improbable that the evangelist employed a connected and tolerably complete history of Peter, in his descriptions of that apostle contained in the first part of the book. If he did, it was of late origin ; for legends had gathered round the name and work of Peter.

3. The 13th and 14th chapters, forming a complete section, seem to be derived from a written source. Their commencement and form favour this opinion. The name *Saul* is not placed immediately after Barnabas, as it is at the close of the 12th chapter; but after all the names (xiii. 1, 2), pointing to a different source from that of the preceding chapter. The form of the narrative, too, is like an epitomised one; but the language is the same as that of the whole book, and other evidences of the general writer's hand are not wanting. We allow the deficiency of clear proof that a written document was at the basis of the account of Paul's first missionary journey. But though the evidence is slight, it must be taken for something, in opposition to Overbeck. The discourse in the synagogue at Antioch (xiii. 16–41), which resembles that of Stephen, bears the impress of the writer himself.

4. At xix. 16 something seems to have been omitted. The historian has furnished a very meagre extract from the source before him. The second pronoun *them* presupposes the knowledge of other circumstances.

5. Acts xi. 28 and xxi. 10 were taken from indepen-

dent sources, because Agabus is spoken of in the latter passage as if he had not been introduced before.

But it is impossible to specify the documents which the writer used. On the one hand, he had a diary or diaries of missionary journeys; on the other he had the epistles of Paul. Oral traditions were also current, of which he availed himself, derived in the first instance from Paul, James, the church at Jerusalem, Silas, Philip the deacon, and John Mark. Schneckenburger, after Feilmoser, lays too much stress on xxi. 9, in order to show Luke's connection with Philip's family;[1] and Credner's view, that he got the greater part of the information contained in the first twelve chapters from John Mark, is improbable.[2] Whatever the sources were, the writer did not hesitate to use them freely, changing, abridging, adding, adapting, and shaping them to suit the leading purpose he had in view. In its present form the book is neither fragments nor extracts from documents, nor even the faithful representation of earlier traditions, nor both together; but a composition partly compiled and partly original, bearing evidence of one person in matter and language.

AUTHORSHIP.

Under this head we shall show that the book proceeded from one man; that it was written by the author of the third gospel; and that his name cannot be identified with any of those who accompanied Paul.

1. The following terms and expressions, which occur in all parts of the book, are peculiar to the author: ἀγόραιος and ἀγοραῖος xvii. 5, xix. 38; ἀκατάκριτος xvi. 37, xxii. 25; ἀναντίῤῥητος xix. 36; ἀναντιῤῥήτως x. 29; ἀποφθέγγεσθαι ii. 4, 14, xxvi. 25; ἀσμένως ii. 14, xxi. 17; ἅφνω ii. 2, xvi. 26, xxviii. 6; βία v. 26, xxi. 35, xxiv. 7, xxvii. 41; δῆμος xii. 22, xvii. 5, xix. 30, 33; δημόσιος v.

[1] *Ueber den Zweck der Apostelgeschichte*, p. 121.

[2] *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, p. 281.

18; δημοσία xvi. 37, xviii. 28, xx. 20; διάλεκτος i. 19, ii. 6, 8, xxi. 40, xxii. 2, xxvi. 14; διαπρίειν v. 33, vii. 54; διασπείρειν viii. 1, 4, xi. 19; διαπονεῖσθαι iv. 2, xvi. 18; διαφθορά ii. 27, 31, xiii. 34, 35, 36, 37; διαχειρίζεσθαι v. 30, xxvi. 21; ἐκδιηγεῖσθαι xiii. 41, xv. 3; ἐκψύχειν v. 5, 10, xii. 23; ἐπιβουλή ix. 24, xx. 3, 19, xxiii. 30; ἐνέδρα xxiii. 16, xxv. 3; ἐπιδημεῖν ii. 10, xvii. 21; τῇ ἐπιούσῃ with or without a substantive, vii. 26, xvi. 11, xx. 15, xxi. 18, xxiii. 11; εὐφροσύνη ii. 28, xiv. 17; ζήτημα xv. 2, xviii. 15, xxiii. 29, xxv. 19, xxvi. 3; καρδιογνώστης i. 24, xv. 8; κατασείειν τῇ χειρί or τὴν χεῖρα xii. 17, xiii. 16, xix. 33, xxi. 40; μεταπέμπεσθαι x. 5, 22, 29, xi. 13, xx. 1, xxiv. 24, 26, xxv. 3; μηδαμῶς x. 14, xi. 8; νεανίας, vii. 58, xx. 9, xxiii. 17, 18, 22; περιαστράπτειν ix. 3, xxii. 6; πλοῦς xxi. 7, xxvii. 9, 10; πνοή ii. 2, xvii. 25; προορᾶν ii. 25, xxi. 29; προχειρίζεσθαι iii. 20, xxii. 14, xxvi. 16; στερεοῦν iii. 7, 16, xvi. 5; συγχέειν, συγχύνειν ii. 6, ix. 22, xix. 32, xxi. 27, 31; σύγχυσις xix. 29; συζήτησις xv. 2, 7, xxviii. 29; τεσσαρακονταετὴς vii. 23, xiii. 18; ὑπηρετεῖν xiii. 36, xx. 34, xxiv. 23; χειραγωγεῖν ix. 8, xxii. 11; χειραγωγός xiii. 11; ἄνδρες Γαλιλαῖοι, Ἰουδαῖοι, Ἰσραηλῖται i. 11, ii. 14, 22, iii. 12, v. 35, xiii. 16, xxi. 28; ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι xvii. 21, 22; ἄνδρες Ἐφέσιοι xix. 35; ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί ii. 29; xiii. 15, 26; xv. 7, 13; xxii. 1; xxiii. 1, 6; xxviii. 17.

2. There are words and phrases characteristic of the writer, because they occur so seldom elsewhere, or are so often repeated as to show they are favourites. ἀπειλή three times, only once in Ephesians besides; ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν; αἵρεσις *sect*, only three times in all other parts of the New Testament, besides the Acts; ἄξιος; ἅπας fourteen times, third gospel nineteen times, only nine times in the other books; ἀσφαλής, ἀσφαλῶς, ἀσφαλίζειν, ἀσφάλεια; βουλή; γένος; γνωστός; ἔκστασις and ἐξίστασθαι; ἔμφοβος and ἔντρομος; ἐπαγγελία a Pauline word; ἐργασία; εὐσχήμων; ἱκανὸς *much* or *many*, eighteen times in the Acts, sixteen times in the third gos-

pel, only thrice elsewhere; καιροί; μέρη; κλῆος; οἰκουμένη; οἶκος *family*; ὅραμα eleven times in the Acts, once in Matthew; σωτήρ, σωτηρία, σωτήριον, χάρις, Pauline words.

Of verbs we may adduce, ἄλλεσθαι, ἀνάγειν, ἀναιρεῖν, ἀνακρίνειν, ἀναλαμβάνειν, ἀναστρέφειν intransitive; ἀνατρέφειν, ἀνιστάναι transitive, ἀποδέχεσθαι, ἀποφθέγγεσθαι, ἀπωθεῖσθαι, ἀτενίζειν, αὐξάνειν, ἀφίσταναι, βοᾶν, δεῖ, διαλέγεσθαι, διανοίγειν, διαμαρτύρεσθαι, διατρίβειν, διέρχεσθαι, διελθεῖν ἕως, δοκεῖν, εἰσάγειν, εἰσιέναι, ἐκτίθεσθαι, ἐξαιρεῖν, ἐξαποστέλλειν, ἐξηγεῖσθαι, ἐξάγειν, ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι, ἐπικαλεῖσθαι, ἐπιπίπτειν, εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, ἐφιστάναι, ἔχειν *to be*, κακοῦν, καταγγέλλειν, κατάγειν, καταλαμβάνεσθαι middle, κατανοεῖν, κατέρχεσθαι, κελεύειν, λατρεύειν, μαρτυρεῖσθαι *to be well reported of*, μεγαλύνειν, μένειν *to dwell*, μετακαλεῖσθαι, μεταπέμπεσθαι, μεταλαμβάνειν, νομίζειν, ὁρίζειν, παραγγέλλειν, παραγίνεσθαι, παύεσθαι, προσέχειν, προχειρίζεσθαι, πείθειν and πείθεσθαι, σέβεσθαι, στερεοῦν, συγκαλεῖν, συμβάλλειν, συμπαραλαμβάνειν, συναρπάζειν, σύρειν, ὑπάρχειν, ὑποστρέφειν. Verbs compounded with prepositions are often chosen, especially such as have ἀνά and διά.

3. With respect to adverbs, prepositions, and particles, the following are characteristic: adverbs derived from πᾶς, as πανταχοῦ, πάντη, πάντως, διαπαντός; ἑξῆς and καθεξῆς, κακεῖ and κακεῖθεν, ἐνθάδε, ἄχρι especially in the phrase ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας, or ἄχρι τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης; adverbs expressing suddenness as ἄφνω, ἐξαυτῆς, ἐξαίφνης, παραχρῆμα; the prepositions σὺν and ἐνώπιον, καθότι and καθώς, ὁμοθυμαδόν, τανῦν, μὲν οὖν and μὲν γάρ, μέν not followed by δέ, as it should be by rule; τε, which occurs no less than 140 times at least in the Acts, whereas in all other parts of the New Testament it is found but fifty-three times, ἐν τάχει, ἐν ὀλίγῳ, ἐν μέσῳ, ἐπ' ἀληθείας, ὃν τρόπον, κατὰ πρόσωπον.

4. Peculiar forms of words, combinations, constructions and phraseology pervade the work, which are also found for the most part in the third gospel.

Ἰερουσαλὴμ oftener than Ἱεροσόλυμα, common to the Acts and gospel.

ἑστὼς the perfect participle in both.

The future infinitive ἔσεσθαι always with μέλλειν.

The neuter of a participle with the article, for a substantive, as τὸ εἰωθός, τὸ γεγονός, τὸ συμβεβηκός, τὸ ὡρισμένον, τὸ γεννώμενον, τὸ διοτεταγμένον, τὰ κατεστραμμένα, τὰ κεκριμένα.

εἷς ἕκαστος in the Acts and gospel.

The periphrasis τὰ περί τινος and οἱ περί τινα in both.

The interrogative τίς ἄν in both.

The relative is very frequently attracted by the antecedent, both in the Acts and gospel.

The relative ὅ has a clause or sentence for antecedent.

Interrogative clauses are introduced by τὸ in both.

The frequent use of the article before an infinitive, especially the genitive τοῦ, in both.

To a verb is appended a participle, the latter followed by another participle without καὶ between, Acts xii. 4; gospel iv. 20.

δὲ καὶ nine times in the Acts; twenty-nine times in the gospel.

καὶ αὐτὸς or αὐτοὶ very frequent in both.

αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ in both.

ἐπὶ or κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ in both.

The plural of a verb often agrees with a singular noun in sense, such as πλῆθος, in both.

Paraphrastic expressions with πρόσωπον, χεὶρ and ἡμέρα often occur.

εἰπεῖν and λαλεῖν are usually construed with πρὸς in both. The same applies to φάναι in the Acts.

παρὰ τοὺς πόδας in both. Always πρὸς τοὺς πόδας elsewhere, except in Matt. xv. 30.

ἄνδρες is often put before another substantive in direct address.

A name is introduced by ὀνόματι in both. Some-

times καλούμενος is added, or ἐπικαλούμενος, ἐπικληθείς, ὃς ἐπικαλεῖται, ὃς ἐπεκλήθη.

γῆ is often put before proper names of countries.

αἱ ἡμέραι τῶν ἀζύμων instead of ἄζυμα.

The inhabitants of a country or city are described by οἱ κατὰ τήν, etc.

αἴτιον in both instead of αἰτία.

ἐπιβάλλειν τὰς χεῖρας *to attack*, in both.

ἡ ὁδὸς *Christianity*, four times in the Acts.

ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπί in both.

κρεμᾶν ἐπί ξύλου, applied to the death of Christ.

Expressions with καρδία are frequent, as θέσθαι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις, διατηρεῖν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, etc.

A similar verb and noun are put together, as ἀπειλῇ ἀπειλεῖσθαι, παραγγελίᾳ παραγγέλλειν, βάπτισμα βαπτίζειν, in both.

ἦν or ἦσαν with the participle are used for a finite verb very frequently, in both.

θεὶς τὰ γόνατα in both.

πορεύεσθαι is used to make the language more graphic, fifty times in the gospel, and thirty-eight times in the Acts.

αἴρειν φωνὴν and ἐπαίρειν τὴν φωνήν, in both.

φόβος ἐγένετο in both.

φόβος ἐπέπεσε in both.

ἐγένετο δὲ always followed in the Acts by an infinitive, except in v. 7 where a finite verb with καὶ succeeds. The latter construction is more usual in the gospel.

ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ in both.

Expressions denoting fulness are frequent, as πλῆθος, ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος, πολὺ πλῆθος, πλήρης, πληροῦν, πληθύνειν, πλησθῆναι, in both.

To describe feelings or qualities μέγας is often put with the noun, as φόβος μέγας, etc.

ἐπιπίπτειν applied to the sudden influence of the Spirit.

λαμβάνειν τὸ πνεῦμα.

πλησθῆναι πνεύματος ἁγίου, in both.

The optative mood, generally rare in the New Testament, occurs nine times in both works.

5. Subsequent parts refer to and imply what has been already said.

'John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost' (xi. 16). This refers to i. 5: 'John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.'

'Now they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, travelled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch,' etc. (xi. 19). This is linked to viii. 1: 'And at that time there was a great persecution against the church which was at Jerusalem, and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria,' etc.

'And Saul *yet* breathing out threatenings and slaughter,' etc. (ix. 1), referring to viii. 3, 'as for Saul, he made havoc of the church,' etc.

'Then departed Barnabas to Tarsus for to seek Saul' (xi. 25), referring to ix. 30, where it is said that Paul was sent to Tarsus.

'Now there were in the church that was at Antioch,' etc. etc. (xiii. 1). Only from xi. 19–26, is it known that there was a church there previously.

'God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us' (xv. 8); referring to x. 47, 'that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we.'

Chapter xv. 36 presupposes the 13th chapter.

'Paul thought not good to take him with them, who departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work' (xv. 38), is unintelligible without xiii. 13: 'Paul and his company came to Perga in Pamphylia: and John, departing from them, returned to Jerusalem.'

'And as they went through the cities they delivered them the decrees to keep, that were ordained of the

apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem' (xvi. 4), presupposing xv. 28, 29.

'And when Silas and Timotheus were come from Macedonia, Paul was pressed in the spirit,' etc. (xviii. 5), referring to xvii. 14, 15.

'And it came to pass, that, while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper coasts came to Ephesus,' etc. (xix. 1), referring to xviii. 23, which states that Paul went over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia in order.

In xxi. 8, Philip is spoken of as 'one of the seven,' alluding to vi. 5, and especially to viii. 40, where we read that Philip 'was found at Azotus, and passing through he preached in all the cities till he came to Cæsarea.' He disappears at Cæsarea, and reappears there after a long interval.

'For they had seen before with him in the city, Trophimus, an Ephesian,' etc. (xxi. 29), referring to xx. 4.

'And when the blood of thy martyr Stephen was shed I also was standing by and consenting unto his death, and kept the raiment of them that slew him' (xxii. 20), alluding to vii. 58; viii. 1. Here the coincidence is verbal in part.

'Certain Jews from Asia found me purified in the temple,' etc. (xxiv. 18), referring to xxi. 26.

The statement that Paul had appealed to Cæsar, xxv. 21; xxvi. 32; xxvii. 24; xxviii. 19, refers to xxv. 11. These mutual references cannot be explained away by the criticism of Schwanbeck.[1]

6. The method of quotation is similar throughout the book. The Septuagint is the sole source of all citations, some of which are verbal, others a little altered but unlike the Hebrew. Examples of the first kind are found in ii. 34, etc.; iv. 25, 26; viii. 32, 33; xiii. 33, 35. Instances of the second are in i. 20; ii. 17–21; iii. 22, 23, 25; vii. 3, 6, 7, 32, 49, 50; xiii. 34, 41, 47; xv. 16,

[1] *Ueber die Quellen der Schriften des Lucas*, p. 51, *et seq.*

17; xxviii. 26, 27. A few differ so much from the Hebrew as to contradict it, though they are from the Greek, e.g. ii. 25, 28; vii. 42, 43; xv. 16, 17.

From these linguistic and other phenomena it is clear, that the writer of the book was not a mere compiler, but an author. If he used materials he did not put them together so loosely as to leave their language and style in the state he got them, but wrought up the component parts into a work having its own characteristics. The repetition of a fact, such as Paul's conversion, is no proof that the writer was not master of his materials, though Schwanbeck[1] adduces it as such; nor does the work present any ground for the belief that he was dependent on written sources to an extent inconsistent with the freest treatment of history.

7. The identity of the writer with the third evangelist is undoubted, because the diction and style of both is the same. There are—

(*a.*) Words peculiar to the Acts and gospel, such as: αἴτιον Luke xxiii. 4, 14, 22; Acts xix. 40. ἀναδεικνύναι x. 1; Acts i. 24. ἀναζητεῖν ii. 44, 45; Acts xi. 25. ἀνασπᾶν xiv. 5; Acts xi. 10. ἀνευρίσκειν ii. 16; Acts xxi. 4. ἀποδέχεσθαι viii. 40; ix. 11; Acts ii. 41; xv. 4; xviii. 27; xxi. 17; xxiv. 3; xxviii. 30. ἀποτινάσσειν ix. 5; Acts xxviii. 5. διαπορεῖν ix. 7; xxiv. 4; Acts ii. 12; v. 24; x. 17. διατηρεῖν Luke ii. 51; Acts xv. 29. διϊσχυρίζεσθαι xxii. 59; Acts xii. 15. δικαστής xii. 14; Acts vii. 27, 35. διοδεύειν viii. 1; Acts xvii. 1. ἐνεδρύειν xi. 54; Acts xxiii. 21. ἑξῆς with the article, vii. 11; ix. 37; Acts xxi. 1; xxv. 17; xxvii. 18. ἐπιδεῖν i. 25; Acts iv. 29. ἐπιβιβάζειν x. 34; xix. 35; Acts xxiii. 24. ἐπιφωνεῖν xxiii. 21; Acts xii. 22; xxi. 34; xxii. 24. ἐπιχειρεῖν i. 1; Acts ix. 29; xix. 13. εὐλαβής ii. 25; Acts ii. 5; viii. 2; xxii. 12. εὐτόνως xxiii. 10; Acts xviii. 28. ζωογονεῖν xvii. 33; Acts vii. 19. ἴασις xiii. 32; Acts iv. 22, 30. καθεξῆς i. 3; viii. 1; Acts

[1] *Ueber die Quellen der Schriften des Lucas*, p. 70.

iii. 24; xi. 4; xviii. 23. καθιέναι v. 19; Acts ix. 25; x. 11; xi. 5. καθότι i. 7; xix. 9; Acts ii. 24, 25; iv. 35; xvii. 31. κατακλείειν iii. 20; Acts xxvi. 10. κατακολουθεῖν xxiii. 55; Acts xvi. 17. κλάσις xxiv. 35; Acts ii. 42. μεγαλεῖα i. 49; Acts ii. 11. ὀδυνᾶσθαι ii. 48; xvi. 24, 25; Acts xx. 38. ὁμιλεῖν xxiv. 14, 15; Acts xx. 11; xxiv. 26. ὀχλεῖσθαι vi. 18; Acts v. 16. παραβιάζεσθαι xxiv. 29; Acts xvi. 15. περιλάμπειν ii. 9; Acts xxvi. 13. προϋπάρχειν xxiii. 12; Acts viii. 9. σκάπτειν vi. 48; xiii. 8; xvi. 3. σκάφη Acts xxvii. 16, 30, 32. στρατιά ii. 13; Acts vii. 42. συγγένεια i. 61; Acts vii. 3, 14. συμβάλλειν ii. 19; xiv. 31; Acts iv. 15; xvii. 18; xviii. 27; xx. 14; συμπληροῦν viii. 23; ix. 51; Acts ii. 1. συναθροίζειν xxiv. 33; Acts xii. 12; xix. 25; συναρπάζειν viii. 29; Acts vi. 12; xix. 29; xxvii. 15; συνεῖναι ix. 18; Acts xxii. 11. τραυματίζειν xx. 12; Acts xix. 16. ὑπολαμβάνειν vii. 43; x. 30; Acts i. 9; ii. 15 (3 John 8?)

(*b.*) Favourite expressions and phrases occur in both, already given under 2.

(*c.*) Peculiar forms of words, construction and phraseology, already specified under 4.

These phenomena prove that the author of both works is one and the same, a fact which no critic ventures to impugn.

8. Who then was the writer?

The most ancient opinion points to Luke, in favour of which both external and internal evidence speak.

As to the external:—

The authorship has been generally ascribed to Luke the evangelist, not merely because the third gospel has been assigned to him, but because all external evidence is to that effect. As we have put the gospel later than Luke, the Acts were not written by him.

Various references to the Acts are marked by Hefele in Clement's epistle to the Corinthians. In the second chapter, where the words 'giving more willingly than

receiving,'[1] are supposed to be taken from Acts xx. 35; in the fifth chapter, where Paul's seven times' imprisonment is spoken of; and in the eighteenth, where the beginning of a citation from Psalm lxxxviii. 21 is thought to resemble Acts xiii. 22. But these are uncertain, especially the last two; and the first is probably from an apocryphal gospel. De Gebhardt and Harnack produce other passages resembling the Acts, but admit their insufficiency to prove the use of the book in the Clementine epistle.[2] Nor does the Shepherd of Hermas show the existence of the Acts; only one place having a faint allusion to Acts iv. 12.[3]

Two passages in the Ignatian letters have been brought into connection with the Acts, one in the third chapter of that to the Smyrnæans: 'After his resurrection he did eat and drink with them, as he was flesh,'[4] supposed to refer to Acts x. 41; and another in his letter to the Philadelphians, viz. 'for there are many wolves who seem worthy of belief,'[5] etc., supposed to allude to Acts xx. 29. The parallelism in both is slight. The epistle of Polycarp has one passage showing acquaintance with the Acts, viz. in the first chapter, where we read that God 'raised up Christ, having loosed the pains of death,'[6] alluding to Acts ii. 24. Another, which is appealed to for the same purpose, 'if we suffer for his name let us glorify him,'[7] is too remote from Acts v. 41.

The Clementine Homilies have but one place that can be supposed to contain a reference to the Acts, viz. in iii. 53, the words, 'I am he of whom Moses prophesied saying, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise

[1] ἥδιον διδόντες ἢ λαμβάνοντες.

[2] *Patr. Apost. Opera*, i. 1, prolegomena, p. liv., ed. 2.

[3] ὅτι δι' οὐδενὸς δύνῃ σωθῆναι εἰ μὴ διὰ τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ ἐνδόξου ὀνόματος. —*Visio* iv. 2.

[4] μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς καὶ συνέπιεν ὡς σαρκικός.

[5] πολλοὶ γὰρ λύκοι ἀξιόπιστοι, κ.τ.λ.

[6] ὃν ἤγειρεν ὁ Θεός, λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ ᾅδου.—Cap. i.

[7] καὶ ἐὰν πάσχωμεν διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, δοξάζωμεν αὐτόν.—Cap. viii.

up,'[1] etc. It is unlikely, however, that the writer of the homilies took it from the Acts rather than tradition.

It is doubtful whether Justin Martyr employed the book or cited it. Probably it was not unknown to him, though he made no use of it. Some passages resemble parts of the Acts, but the likeness may be accidental.[2]

In the epistle to Diognetus, there are but two places that resemble passages in the Acts, one in the third and another in the eleventh chapter; and the resemblance is remote except in sense.

A passage from the third gospel and the Acts is given in the letter of the churches of Vienne and Lyons (A.D. 177). 'They prayed for those who were so bitter in their hostility, like Stephen that perfect martyr: Lord, lay not this sin to their charge' (Acts vii. 60).[3] This is the first definite evidence of the existence of the work. Irenæus expressly assigns it to Luke; and later writers do the same. We are thus brought to the close of the second century for the first express notice of authorship; there is no proof of its existence prior to A.D. 160. If the work originated about A.D. 120, the date cannot be disproved; and there was time enough between it and A.D. 180 for the traditional opinion to take root. The earliest and all but universal view was that which assigned the work to Luke.

Internal evidence does not justify the current opinion of authorship. The work itself does not state that Luke wrote it. At chapter xvi. 10, the pronoun *we* first occurs, when Paul was about to leave Troas. The *we* continues till the seventeenth verse, and then disappears till xx. 5, when the pronoun occurs again in connection with Troas. From this place the writer

[1] *ἐγὼ εἰμι περὶ οὗ Μωϋσῆς προεφήτευσεν εἰπών· Προφήτην ἐγερεῖ ὑμῖν Κύριος, κ.τ.λ.*—*H.* iii. 53.

[2] See Zeller's *Die Apostelgeschichte, u. s. w.*, p. 26, *et seq.*

[3] *καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν τὰ δεινὰ διατιθέιτων ηὔχοντο, καθάπερ Στέφανος ὁ τέλειος μάρτυς· Κύριε, μὴ στήσῃς αὐτοῖς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ταύτην.*

appears to have accompanied the apostle to Jerusalem. At xxi. 18 the *we* again disappears, and is not resumed till xxvii. 1, at the commencement of the apostle's journey from Cæsarea to Rome. Hence the *we*-sections are strictly xvi. 10–17; xx. 5–15; xxi. 1–18; xxvii. 1–xxviii. 16. From Troas the person implied in the pronoun accompanies Paul to Philippi but is not imprisoned there, for Paul and Silas leave the place without him. Nothing farther is known of the concealed individual till he joins the apostle again at Troas, and accompanies him to Jerusalem, where he is lost sight of till he goes from Cæsarea to Rome. For our present object it is not necessary to abide by the *we*-sections closely, since the authorship of the whole book is under discussion. Is it possible or probable that a companion of the apostle could have written the narratives after xvi. 10? The 16th chapter furnishes evidence to the contrary. The circumstances relating to the imprisonment of Paul and Silas at Philippi are sufficient to disprove the authorship of an eyewitness. In like manner, an eyewitness could hardly have represented the apostle as acting in the manner described in xxi. 20–28, etc., performing a Jewish rite in the temple, that the people might see his continued adherence to the law, or as speaking and acting in the way represented in xxiii. 6, etc., where his statement was adapted to give a false impression, and he resorted to a questionable measure in self-defence. The same unhistorical air is more apparent in the 28th chapter (verses 3–10). The second part of the book contains other descriptions, the credibility of which cannot be maintained.

The first part points to the same conclusion. In the first epistle to the Corinthians, the speaking with tongues is described by Paul in a way that shows it to have been the incoherent effusion of an ecstatic state of mind—excited utterances without a definite meaning; whereas the Pentecostal phenomena imply

the miraculous gift of unknown languages. How then could Luke, Paul's companion, give a different account? He must also have known, that Peter was not the first to assert the great principle of the Gentiles' right to the privileges of Christianity (x. 35), but Paul. Nor would a companion of the apostle himself have made the narratives of the latter's conversion and stay in Jerusalem improbable and contradictory. In short, a fair examination of the contents betrays a later standpoint and an apologetic design. The traditional and miraculous elements, which appear in strong and frequent colours, with other internal phenomena, set aside the idea of Luke's authorship. The great apostle of the Acts is too unlike the writer of his own epistles to allow of the supposition that a friend or companion wrote the book.

How then did the belief of Luke's authorship arise and become general in the early churches? Whoever the unknown was, he wrote as if he were Paul's companion. To recommend his production, he set it forth in the name of one who was known to be an associate of the apostle. This method of writing, common in the first and especially in the second century, was adopted with a laudable object. Its representatives considered it right to treat past history from a religious point of view, in furtherance of the doctrines they held. As they had not a proper notion of historical criticism, the turn they gave to events of the past did not seem to them a perversion of the facts, but a mode of looking at them suited to the purpose in view.

There is some plausibility in the view that Timothy wrote such parts of the book as have the first person, viz. xvi. 10–17; xx. 5–15; xxi. 1–18; xxvii. 1–xxviii. 16; and the distinguished critics, Schleiermacher, De Wette, and Bleek, give reasons in its favour. It is alleged that Paul's companions are named elsewhere (xiii. 2, 5; xv. 2, 40; xvi. 3; xviii. 18; xx.

4), but Luke never, not even at xvi. 10 where it is believed that he joined Paul. Scheckenburger's reply, that Titus is named neither at Acts xv. 2 nor elsewhere, is irrelevant, because Titus does not appear in the book.

The close connection between xvi. 10 and the preceding verse, does not consist with the idea that Luke appeared as Paul's companion at that very time, and is included in the pronoun *we*. The introduction of the first person plural is abrupt and unexpected, suggested by no preparatory circumstances. But it can be proved that Timothy was in Paul's company after xvi. 10. So too from xx. 5 and onwards ; as also during the journey to Rome, xxvii. 1, etc. It is improbable that Luke joined Paul so early as xvi. 10, because he is unnoticed in the epistles to the Thessalonians ; and the silence of the Philippian epistle is opposed to the view that he stayed at Philippi. The absence of Luke's name from the epistles written before the apostle's imprisonment at Rome, is fatal to the supposition that he accompanied Paul from Troas onward. Again, Timothy is not mentioned in xvi. 19, etc. This agrees with the fact that *he* was the narrator, not Luke, else he would have been specified as he is elsewhere (xvii. 14, etc. ; xviii. 5).

The eyewitness was a Jewish Christian, according to the designations of time used in xx. 6, xxvii. 9. Luke was a Gentile. Schneckenburger,[1] however, supposes that the use of a Jewish calendar by Gentile Christians was a highly probable thing at least before one peculiarly Christian was adopted ; and Lekebusch[2] adds, that the writer accompanied Paul, who, as a native Jew, employed the Jewish reckoning. Both are mere assumptions.

The passage in Acts xx. 4, 5, where the writer distinguishes himself from certain persons mentioned by

[1] *Ueber den Zweck der Apostelgeschichte*, p. 18.

[2] *Die Composition und Entstehung der Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 391, 392.

name, Sopater, Aristarchus, Secundus, Gaius, Timothy, Tychicus, and Trophimus, 'These having gone forward waited for *us* at Troas,' is against Timothy's authorship. It is contrary to the ordinary rules of construction to refer the pronoun, *these*, at the beginning of the fifth verse, to the last two only, Tychicus and Trophimus. All the names, including Timothy's, must be referred to. Even if Timothy be the *we*-writer, he did not write the whole book as Mayerhoff supposes,[1] which would involve the untenable opinion that Timothy wrote the third gospel, not to speak of the insuperable objections against it in the Acts; and that Luke merely transcribed the two works written by Timothy, adding a few words here and there.

It is less likely that Silas was the writer included in the first person plural, than either Luke or Timothy; though Schwanbeck supposes that he wrote the memoranda beginning at xv. 13, and the rest of the book, with a few exceptions. The words of xv. 22 could hardly have come from him: 'Then it pleased the apostles and elders, with the whole church, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch, with Paul and Barnabas; namely, Judas surnamed Barnabas, and Silas, *chief men among the brethren*.' Remarks upon the Silas-hypothesis are unnecessary, after the refutation of it by Lekebusch and Zeller.

The identification of Silas and Luke is utterly improbable, whatever similarity exists between the names Lucas or Lucanus, and Silas or Silvanus—the one derived from *lucus*, a grove, the other from *silva* a wood.

It is impossible to discover the person included in the *we*-sections. He may have been Luke, though various phenomena are unfavourable to this view, as we have already stated. The decision lies between him and Timothy. One fact agrees best with Luke's authorship

[1] *Einleitung in die Petrinischen Schriften*, pp. 1–30.

of the *we*-sections, viz. that the whole book came to be generally assigned to him. From having written some parts it was easy to transfer all to him. Whoever was the author he witnessed the events described and kept a journal. He was not the general writer, for the *we*-sections are distinguished from the rest of the book by peculiarities of form and contents. They appear abruptly without preparation; and disappear in the same way. It is a curious fact, that the familiar *we* is usually found where Paul is on a journey, and ceases when he remains in a place. And why does the narrator, if he was Paul's companion, describe voyages and travels so minutely, while important periods of considerable length are despatched inexactly and cursorily (comp. xviii. 22–23, xxi. 1–3, xxiv. 27, xxviii. 30). The whole of Paul's third journey, of which little more than the abode at Ephesus is described, is rapidly passed though it must have been in his document. And he has made insertions in it, as the speech in xx. 16–38. The view that the *we*-narrator is the author of the book, though ably advocated by Klostermann, is refuted by Overbeck.[1]

The general writer gives evidence enough of his remoteness from the times and scenes he speaks of. He inserted these *we*-portions from the journal kept by Paul's companion, but not without alteration. The first person plural was left untouched.

No proper link of connection can be inferred between the authorship of the *we*-paragraphs and the rest of the treatise from the use of the first person in i. 1. The first person *singular* here is rather against the identity of the two.

[1] See Zeller's *Acts of the Apostles* translated; with Overbeck's introduction to De Wette's *Exposition*, p. 33, etc.

LEADING OBJECT.

Various critics since Schneckenburger have remarked that there is a striking coincidence between the actions and fortunes of Peter with the primitive apostles on the one hand and those of Paul on the other. Peter begins his active ministry by healing a man who had been lame from his birth; Paul performs his first act of healing upon a cripple at Lystra who had never walked. As the shadow of Peter is supposed to work miraculous cures, so handkerchiefs and aprons belonging to Paul possess a magic efficacy. Peter and his companions expel demons; so does Paul at Ephesus, Philippi, and elsewhere. Peter conquers Simon Magus and his sorceries; Paul shows his mastery over Elymas the sorcerer and Ephesian magic. Peter performs a severe miracle on Ananias; Paul does the same to the seven sons of Sceva, through the instrumentality of an evil spirit. The one raises up Tabitha from the dead; the other Eutychus. Peter has worship offered him by Cornelius; the people at Lystra are on the point of sacrificing to Paul, and the barbarous inhabitants of Malta call him a god. This parallelism is remarkable. Can it represent authentic history? There is nothing improbable in the idea that the author took his facts from existing sources; but it is highly improbable that these sources had the coincidences in question, for they indicate purpose. The historical cycles of Providence are on a larger scale and at longer intervals. They are occupied too with great classes of events rather than individual acts. The similarity of miraculous efficacy in the instances mentioned, is striking.

What was the source of this parallelism? It seems to us that Peter's acts were the originals of Paul's. Co-ordinate authority must be ascribed to both, according to the writer. And Peter's deeds were taken from a

source which had its root in the idea that the signs of apostleship must be agreeable to accepted precedents or those of the Old Testament prophets.

In like manner, there is a parallel between the sufferings that befell Paul on the one side, and Peter with his companions, on the other. Paul was imprisoned, as Peter and the other apostles were. Paul was beaten at Philippi; so were the original apostles at Jerusalem. Paul was stoned; so was his prototype, Stephen. As Peter with the other apostles was delivered from prison by an angel, an earthquake set Paul free. The apostles are said to be endowed with the power of handling poisonous serpents with impunity (Luke x. 19); and Paul shakes off a viper, without receiving hurt.

Amid all the opposition he meets with, it is remarkable that Paul is not seriously injured; or if he be, the injury tends to his exaltation. Stoned at Lystra, he rose up immediately, to all appearance unhurt. A special providence watched over him. He was incarcerated at Philippi but miraculously delivered at night, and in the morning entreated by the duumvirs to depart. He became a prisoner in Palestine, and was taken to Rome; but that led to a series of defences, proving his innocence in the eyes of Jewish and heathen authorities. The Pharisees (xxiii. 9), King Agrippa, Lysias, the two procurators admitted his innocence. He suffered shipwreck on his voyage to Italy, but was miraculously saved, and all lives in the vessel were given to him. Thus the apostle triumphed under the most adverse circumstances. His death is unnoticed in accordance with the general desire to glorify him.

Were these all the sufferings which Paul endured, we might think them the result of the circumstances he was placed in, and see nothing incredible in the protection he experienced. But there is a selection of cases. The second epistle to the Corinthians shows that the majority of his misfortunes are omitted. He received thirty-

nine stripes five times ; he was thrice shipwrecked ; he was frequently imprisoned ; he was thrice beaten with rods (2 Cor. xi.). Why are these omitted, as also his fighting with beasts at Ephesus, and his struggles to preserve the Galatian churches from the Judaising Christians ? His bodily infirmities and temptations are also passed over. As the omission of such disasters can hardly be accidental, the similarity of those narrated in the Acts to what befell the primitive apostles, belongs to the writer, who had an object in introducing correspondent misfortunes—some from tradition, others perhaps from his own invention. The primitive apostles and Paul pass through parallel disasters without injury, nay rather with honour, because they are never left without guardian angels, or timely miracles on their behalf.

There is also a parallelism between the apostolic qualifications of Paul and the primitive apostles. His conversion is described three times because it involved the personal appearing of Christ to him. In xviii. 9 ; xxii. 18 ; xxiii. 11, he is favoured with similar manifestations. By such means he becomes a witness of the resurrection of Jesus, which was necessary to apostleship according to i. 22. The visions of Peter and Paul are strikingly alike. The one which opened to Peter a mission to the Gentiles (x.) resembles that which called Paul to the same career. The very voice that spoke is represented as the voice of Christ (x. 14). There are two visions between Peter and Cornelius, as there are two relating to Paul and Ananias. The visions which both apostles had are narrated by themselves repeatedly. Paul possessed the power of imparting the Holy Spirit by the imposition of his hands, like Peter. This mark of an apostle is decisive ; and therefore the apostle of the Gentiles is not behind the favourite head of the Jewish Christians. Paul must be like the primitive apostles in official qualifications.

The conduct of Paul and of the original apostles leads to the same conclusion as the parallels already noticed. We have seen how he acts like a pious Israelite, goes up to the national sanctuary, performs vows, undertakes a Nazarite offering for the very purpose of showing that he did not teach apostasy from the law, preaches to the Jews first, and turns to the Gentiles with reluctance, consents that the Gentile Christians should be required to abstain from fornication as if it were on a par with ceremonial observances, and circumcises Timothy out of respect to the Jews. On the other hand, the Jerusalemite church comes near to Paul's position by recognising at once the principle of Gentile baptism. Philip preaches to the half-Gentile Samaritans; Peter and John are sent to lay their hands on the baptized. Peter baptizes Cornelius the Gentile; and a Gentile Christian church at Antioch, founded before the public appearance of Paul, is recognised by the original church at Jerusalem, which latter sends a communication to the believers there and elsewhere, releasing them from the law and circumcision, at the recommendation of Peter and James. These accounts proceed from a writer who alters circumstances, introduces unhistorical details, turns facts aside from their bearing, and draws upon his imagination.

The teaching of Paul accords with his conduct. Accommodated to the friendly relation he bears to Judaism, it loses its characteristic stamp. Instead of being impregnated with the doctrines of man's universal sinfulness, the abrogation of the law of works, justification by faith, and atonement by the blood of Christ, it is characterised by the exhibition of Jesus's resurrection and Messiahship, repentance and good works. His preaching is that of a Jewish Christian rather than of one who severed Christianity from Judaism. He utters Petrine sentiments; Peter and the early apostles express Pauline ideas. Peter declares that God put no

distinction between Jews and Gentiles; and terms the law a yoke which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear. James himself declares the right of all the Gentiles to the privileges of Christianity. Thus Paul on the one hand, and the primitive Jerusalem church on the other, approach in opinion. The one becomes more Jewish Christian than his epistles warrant; the other more Pauline than all independent accounts represent. Both lose in part their distinctive peculiarities, showing that the writer has treated them from a conciliating point of view.

It is also noteworthy, that the conflicts of Paul with the Jewish Christians in almost all places where there were Gentile converts, are unnoticed. Titus, the uncircumcised friend of the apostle, is not once named, though he was the cause of a dispute at Jerusalem; and the encounter with Peter at Antioch is passed by. The apostle's relations to the Jewish Christian party are friendly rather than adverse. He is often at Jerusalem with the twelve; and the brethren there receive him gladly. It is the unbelieving Jews who appear as his adversaries, not Judaising Christians; and therefore the former alone are specified even in the places where the apostle encountered the enmity of the latter, as at Corinth and Ephesus (xviii. 5, 6, xx. 3, 19).

So, too, unfavourable circumstances in Paul's relations to churches are omitted. The second visit to the Corinthians is passed over because it was a sad one, as we learn from 2 Cor. ii. 1: 'I determined this with myself, that I would not come again to you in heaviness;' language inapplicable to his first visit and therefore implying a second.

The reader will detect an apologetic or conciliatory motive in the omission or insertion of other particulars. Thus, the eleemosynary journey of Paul to Jerusalem, in the 11th chapter, arose from a wish to obviate the offence that the four years' absence of the apostle from

the theocratic centre might have given to Jewish Christians.

The book is a proposal for peace presented to the Judaists by the Pauline party, intended to purchase the recognition of the Gentile Christians by concessions to Judaism, and designed to act upon both parties as an *irenicon*.

This view is opposed by Overbeck,[1] who contends that it is not conciliatory nor designed for Judaising Christians of Jewish descent, but the attempt of a Gentile Christianity already existing (A.D. 115), and strongly influenced by the old Christian Judaism, to clear up its position with regard to the past, that is, with regard to its own origin and its first founder, Paul. The reasons adduced for this modification of Zeller's view are not convincing. When it is argued that the Pauline Gentile Christians could not possibly have held the opinion that the Jewish Christians regarded the Mosaic law as obligatory on them, because in Justin and the Clementines the law is not considered binding; we reply that between the date of the composition of the Acts and that of Justin with the Clementines, there was ample time for development and the disuse of rites. Looking at the opinions of Justin about the Jewish Christians, with the representation of the twelve apostles by the Pauline Barnabas, and the precedence given to the Jews over the Gentiles in the Shepherd of Hermas, the number of Judaising Christians appears to have been sufficiently great at the early date of 120 to justify the view that the Acts was meant for an *irenicon*. Nor can we allow that Gentile Christianity in the author's days was the completely predominant element in the church, as Overbeck argues. The apostolic decree, which leaves it open to Jewish Christians to be subject to the law, while it absolves the Gentiles and

[1] See his *Introduction to the Acts*, prefixed to the English version of Zeller on the book, p. 21, etc. etc.

yet requires them to abstain from habits offensive to Jewish Christianity, has all the appearance of an attempt to conciliate, of a mutual concession bearing on its face a conciliatory stamp. If the author, as we believe, meant to convince his readers of the just title of Gentile Christianity, it shows that the title was disputed by those readers, viz. the Judaists ; and therefore that Gentile Christianity was not completely predominant. The breach with Judaism is long deferred ; Jewish prerogative is constantly recognised ; and Paul's final dedication of himself to the Gentiles is represented as the consequence of the perverse obstinacy of the Jews. They deserted Paul, not he them (chapter xxviii.).

There is an exhibition of purpose about the book. The advocacy of Pauline universalism and the personal authority of Paul, tempered with the constant abandonment of Pauline principles apparently to conciliate Jewish prepossession, the approximation of Peter and the other primitive apostles to the views of Paul, Paul's subordination to the Jew-apostles and their sanction of his mission from the first ; in short, the long series of doctrinal opposites presents a nexus of motives which can only be explained on the assumption that the writer's purpose was to disarm Jewish hostility, and promote Christian unity by attributing to the leaders of the two parties in a distant past that community of doctrine and sentiment which he was desirous to see in his own age. Overbeck's hypothesis does not require such an artificial and elaborate machinery. It assumes the amalgamation of Paulinism and Petrinism too early ; for the catholic Church hardly presented a consolidated Paulinism in the second decade of the second century. We admit, with Overbeck, that the point cannot be settled by mere chronological hypotheses; but chronology has still a bearing upon it, and disagrees with the complete predominance of Gentile

Christianity in the church in Trajan's reign. The catholic Church was not consolidated so soon.

At the same time, there are phenomena in the book which seem to disagree with this purpose. Had that been the writer's intention, why did he not state other things, such as the parallel deaths of Paul and Peter? Why has he set down many facts and particulars which have either no relation to it, or an unsuitable one? Objections of this nature, which play an important part in the criticisms of Lekebusch, overlook the fact that the writer had to do with things described in written documents or handed down by tradition. As he did not make but narrate a history, he could not mould *all* his materials into one consistent shape. In selecting, abridging, modifying, and altering, he had to maintain a measure of historical fidelity, else his purpose would have been defeated. History must not be converted into fiction; it must retain features of verisimilitude. The conciliatory tendency runs through the book in a gentle stream, not in the overwhelming current which could only have arisen from effacing all marks of authentic narrative or historical probability from the materials.

DATE AND PLACE.

From the contents of the first chapter compared with the end of the gospel, an interval of several years must be put between the two books, bringing the date of the Acts soon after A.D. 120.

The sudden termination of the work is often explained by the fact that events had not proceeded farther at the time. The history, it is said, was written during the captivity with which it closes. The contents, however, show that they were composed much later.

The only passage supposed to have a direct bearing on the time when the author wrote is viii. 26: 'And the angel of the Lord spake unto Philip, saying, Arise,

and go toward the south unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem unto Gaza, which is desert.' The last clause of the verse is difficult of explanation, because the pronoun translated *which* may relate to *the city* Gaza, not *the road* leading to it; in which case the state of the city is indicated shortly before the siege of Jerusalem, when the Jews laid waste numerous towns and villages including Gaza, in revenge for the massacre at Cæsarea. Thus the passage would fix the time of writing a little before the destruction of Jerusalem. It is better to make the pronoun agree with *the way*; in which case the words cease to have any bearing on the date.

The traditional elements of the book consign it to a comparatively late period. Thus the transformation of the original gift of tongues from what it was in the apostolic age into the miraculous speaking in new languages, shows that the true account of the charism had been changed. As the gift is introduced not only at Pentecost but at the conversion of Cornelius and the baptism of John's disciples, the writer considered it to consist of nothing else than the power of speaking in unknown tongues. Such an idea could not have originated till many years after the apostolic time. In like manner, the general tendency of the work agrees with a late date. The attempted conciliation of opposite parties refers to a stage of their development at which the rough angles of conflict had been worn off, and they had begun to look at common ground rather than distinctive differences. Jewish and Pauline Christianity were no longer the adverse things presented in the epistle to the Galatians and the Apocalypse. Paul had rejected the essential principle of Judaic Christianity, i.e. the validity of the law, without limitation; declaring that whoever insisted on circumcision renounced connection with the kingdom of Christ; and rigorists of James's party had refused to associate with the uncircumcised (Gal. ii. 11,

etc.). Jewish Christians, the only root of the Christian theocracy (Rev. vii. 1; xiv. 1), would not recognise Paul as a true apostle, according to the epistles to the Corinthians; while the 2nd and 3rd chapters of the Apocalypse censure the eating of flesh connected with idols, which Paul allowed. Thus when Paul and John wrote, the antagonism of the two parties was direct. In James's epistle and that to the Hebrews, the antithesis appears less strongly. But in the Acts, the difference between faith and works is in the background. Doctrinal opposition hardly appears; the ideas of the two parties come near one another; and the question between them is practical. All turns on the validity of the Mosaic law and the admissibility of the Gentiles to the privileges of Christianity. The apostle Paul shows respect for Jewish rites, and circumcises Timothy; he acts in many respects like a Jew; while Peter utters Pauline ideas, and is the instrument of the Gentiles' first admission into the kingdom of Christ. Petrines and Paulines had amalgamated to some extent.

There are also slight hierarchical tendencies which favour a late date. The Samaritans, whom Philip the deacon baptized, could only receive the Holy Ghost by the imposition of an apostle's hands. Is there not here a trace of episcopal tendencies? In like manner, the heretics pointed at in xx. 29, etc., are alluded to in the general way customary in the second century. Thus Justin, speaking of Marcion, writes: 'Many persuaded by him, as the only one acquainted with the truth . . . are carried off irrationally, like lambs by a wolf, and become the prey of atheistic doctrines and of demons.'[1] Using the same figure, Ignatius, in his epistle to the Smyrnæans, calls heretics 'beasts in the shape of men.'[2]

[1] *ὦ πολλοὶ πεισθέντες . . . . ἀλόγως ὡς ὑπὸ λύκου ἄρνες συνηρπασμένοι βορὰ τῶν ἀθέων δογμάτων καὶ δαιμόνων γίνονται.—Apol.* i. c. 58.

[2] *θηρία ἀνθρωπόμορφα.*—Cap. 4.

The passage may perhaps be directed against the Gnostics; but there is no reference to them in the rest of the book.

On four occasions in which it is recorded that the teachers of the new religion came in contact with the Roman authorities, the latter could separate the political and religious sides of Christianity—a fact which points to the second century. The judicial proceedings against believers on account of their religion had been determined by Trajan, at least for Bithynia; and the heathen magistrates who appear, go upon the assumption that accusations against Christians can only be admitted on the ground of definite proof. Thus the church had attained to a peculiar position with regard to the civil authorities; and was asserting its proper rights as a spiritual power—rights recognised by the imperial magistrates. This suggests the time of Trajan at the earliest, the beginning of the period distinguished by a series of public apologies on behalf of Christianity.

To this late date Meyer objects that there is no certain trace of the use of Paul's letters in the book, but on the contrary that there is much in it opposed to the historical notices contained in them. The objection holds equally good against his own date, A.D. 80. Besides, he is inconsistent with himself in allowing that much in the Acts is contradictory to historical notices in the epistles; since he resolves these contradictions into mutual supplements. Reluctantly does he admit, that even with respect to Paul the history has many gaps and is inappropriate in numerous points; while his explanation of it by the contracted nature of the accounts with which the author was obliged to be satisfied at the late period of his writing (A.D. 80), when he had not better information from the apostle or other witnesses, or had not been an eyewitness himself, is inadequate. If such be Luke's method in the Acts—if he had sometimes to depend on imperfect and incon-

gruous materials—the credibility of the history is impaired. It is highly improbable that a companion of the apostle would have delayed to write so long; or that he was confined to sources of information which it is very difficult to adjust to the epistles.

The date in question (A.D. 80), though adopted by Lekebusch, Ewald, and Renan, does not coincide with internal evidence; for the entire purpose of the book, the way in which it presents facts, its legendary narratives and important modifications of primitive Christianity, the pictures given of Peter and Paul, especially of the latter, presuppose larger time than twelve or fifteen years after the apostles' decease.

The place of writing is uncertain. It was probably Rome, as Theophilus appears to have been an Italian. The abrupt termination favours this view. Roman Christians would not need to be told about the fate of the apostle after he was in Rome. And there is an evident tendency in the work to find in that city the culminating point of Paul's activity, the goal of his labours. On the day of Pentecost strangers of Rome were at Jerusalem. Paul says, 'I must see Rome' (xix. 21). He had to bear witness at Rome (xxiii. 11). He appeals to the Roman emperor, when he might have been released in Palestine. His Roman citizenship is spoken of. He is made to pass rapidly through eastern parts that his European ministry may be dwelt upon. The anterior existence of the Roman church is ignored. At Rome he breaks away from the Jews for ever, and turns wholly to the Gentiles. Thus Rome had a peculiar interest for the writer. When he brings the apostle thither, his object is attained. A member of that church intending to promote liberal Christianity, would naturally do so through the medium of a conciliatory work, in which Peter and Paul should approach one another in belief, and bear a mutual resemblance in their deeds. The reconciliation of the Petrines and Paulines

was already an object of desire. To represent the apostle in the accurate light of his own letters would have been prejudicial to the author's design, because the Jewish element in the church was sufficiently strong, even in the second century. The feeling there was so powerful against Paul that it made Peter the first bishop of the church, in defiance of history. There too, in the same century, the Clementine literature originated, with its hostility to the apostle Paul. A Pauline Christian at Rome might well undertake to bring the ecclesiastical parties there nearer to one another, in a work like the Acts. It may serve perhaps to strengthen the view of Rome's being the birthplace of the book, that the first traces of its use are found there. The epistle of Polycarp, where the earliest evidence of its existence appears, was perhaps of Roman origin. On the whole Rome was probably the place whence it issued soon after A.D. 120; though Overbeck adduces plausible considerations in favour of Asia Minor; for example, the special interest in that region which the book betrays, especially the prominence given to Ephesus; and the political character, which points to a country where Christianity first confronted the heathen state, in the reign of Trajan. But these and other phenomena do not, in our opinion, outweigh such as favour a Roman birthplace.

CHRONOLOGY.

The materials are disposed in chronological order, though the writer does not mark times or dates. When he does allude to them, his references are so general that no exact point for reckoning can be got. He speaks often of days, seldom of years. The latter part of the history has more notices of time than the former; probably because many materials were from an eye-witness.

The only event in the book which can be fixed with certainty is the death of Herod Agrippa, A.D. 44, from which we may reckon backwards and forwards. The writer begins with Pentecost, which took place ten days after the ascension, whence events are narrated in chronological succession. But the section in viii. 4–xii. 23 is synchronous. Between the commencement of the history and Herod's death (i. 1–xii. 23), most important events took place, viz. Stephen's martyrdom and Saul's conversion. We cannot ascertain how long that interval was; and different chronologists fix the ascension in different years, from A.D. 29 to 36. After Herod Agrippa's death, the apostle Paul becomes the prominent subject till his captivity at Rome. Thus the history embraces a period of about 31 years. The events which serve as chronological landmarks are, Stephen's death, Paul's conversion, death of Herod, famine in Palestine in the time of Claudius, banishment of the Jews from Rome, Gallio's proconsulship at Corinth, Felix's procuratorship of Judea, and Festus's entrance on office. All these have been ably investigated by Wieseler,[1] whose results are generally correct.

STATE OF THE TEXT.

The text of the Acts has come down from early times in a corrupt state. No part of the New Testament has suffered more from arbitrary caprice. Perhaps the book was so treated by heretics rather than the catholic Church: for it was rejected or little esteemed by the Manicheans, Severians, Marcionites, and others. Though the Ebionites did not repudiate it, Epiphanius says that they had an apocryphal book of Acts filled with statements depreciating Paul. Perhaps also the neglect of the work led to the deterioration of its text. It was not much read in the early churches;

[1] *Chronologie des Apostolischen Zeitalters*, 1848

and Chrysostom says it was wholly unknown to many Christians; a statement that may be rhetorical exaggeration, as Olshausen thinks. From whatever cause, the contents did not attract so much attention or interest as other books, and were little read in public. The history may have been considered of less importance than that in the gospels. One thing is certain, that great liberties were taken with the text in primitive times. The most considerable interpolations are viii. 37; in ix. 5, 6, 'it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he, trembling and astonished, said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him;' and in xxiv. 6, 7, 8, the words, 'and would have judged according to our law; but the chief captain Lysias came upon us and with great violence took him away out of our hands, commanding his accusers to come unto thee;' all which the best editors expunge.

The Greek text, as it appears in MSS. D. E., especially the former, and as represented in the old Latin and Syriac versions, is peculiar. Additions, emendations, and explanatory notes disfigure it. Yet Bornemann has edited the text after D. which he supposes to be the original one.[1] Thus the nineteenth verse of the 14th chapter begins with 'now while they tarried and taught,' etc. etc., in C. D. E.[2] Instead of xvi. 39 D. has, 'and coming with many friends into the prison they besought them to go out, saying, We did not know your affair, that ye are just men; and when they had brought them forth they besought them, saying, Depart from this city lest those who cry out against you turn again to us; and when they had gone forth,' etc. These words never belonged to the genuine text, any more than a number of others which D. and its correlatives exhibit, such as those in xii. 10; xvi. 10. The per-

[1] *Acta Apostolorum ab sancto Luca conscripta, ad codicis Cantabrigiensis omnium præstantissimi reliquorumque monumentorum fidem, etc.*, 1847.

[2] C. omits the *and* between the participles.

ception of Bornemann is weak in not seeing the nature of the readings in D. that differ from the text of the oldest and best uncial MSS. But we must refer the reader to his long preface. No critic can subscribe to the statement, 'I think it beyond doubt that D. excels all other MSS. in internal goodness, to an extent that is incredible, and that a better and earlier text is contained in no other parchment which has come down to our time, so that the work may be said to have issued from the most complete and ancient fountain of all.'

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

COLOSSÆ AND ITS CHURCH.

COLOSSÆ, a city of Phrygia Pacatiana, was situated on the river Lycus, not far from Laodicea and Hierapolis. The name is written both *Colossæ* and *Colassæ*; ancient authorities being divided between them. Lachmann adopts Colassæ in his edition of the Greek Testament; but Tischendorf has Colossæ, which is best supported by authority at least in the epistle itself. He allows, however, that the inscription *to the Colassians* is the better reading. There is not sufficient reason for departing from the usual orthography, which is also the older one. *Colassæ* was a later form.

It is called a great city by Herodotus. Xenophon styles it *prosperous* and *large*. Its greatness sank when Laodicea and Hierapolis rose into importance, first under the Seleucidæ and then the Romans. Strabo puts it amongst several other *little towns*,[1] which lay around Apamea and Laodicea. In the time of Paul it was neither large nor wealthy.[2]

It is uncertain when a church was founded there; but it must have been after the period specified in Acts xviii. 23, as we infer from a comparison of Coloss. ii. 1 with Acts xviii. 23. The community consisted of Gentile Christians, according to i. 25, 27; ii. 11, 13; iii. 5, 7.

[1] πολίσματα.

[2] See Steiger's *Der Brief Pauli an die Kolosser*, pp. 13–74.

WHO PLANTED THE CHURCH.

Some attribute the origin of the church to Paul himself; others to Epaphras or one of Paul's disciples. On this point, the notices are neither definite nor satisfactory.

Lardner has stated most of the considerations, founded on the epistle itself and that to Philemon, in support of the view that the church was planted by the apostle himself;[1] to which Schulz[2] and Wiggers[3] have added others. The following is a summary of them.

1. We learn from the Acts that Paul travelled twice through Phrygia. Hence it is probable that in one or other journey he visited the principal cities, Colossæ and Laodicea. Is it likely that he went through the country without planting churches in cities and towns so important as these?

The fact that the apostle travelled twice through Phrygia, does not prove that he visited Colossæ and Laodicea. In his first journey, he passed from Cilicia and Derbe to Lystra, thence through the north-east of Phrygia, to Galatia, Mysia, and Troas. Thus his route lay north of Laodicea, Hierapolis, and Colossæ. In his second journey, he went from Lystra to Phrygia, thence northward to Galatia, and subsequently to Troas. This route was also to the north of those three cities. It is possible that he may have turned aside from the direct way and have traversed *all the country* of Galatia and Phrygia in order (Acts xviii. 23); but the word *all* is not in the original; and if Phrygia possessed sixty-two towns, as Hierocles states, he could not have published the gospel in all. Probably, however, there were not so many towns then as in the sixth century.

2. The epistle exhibits proofs of the intimacy subsisting between the writer and the Colossian believers.

[1] *Works*, vol. iii. 4to ed. [2] *Studien und Kritiken*, 1829.
[3] *Studien und Kritiken*, 1838.

He seems to have a correct knowledge of their state, is confident that they had been grounded in the faith, speaks of their love to him, and gives exhortations implying a personal acquaintance and inducing the belief that he first taught them (i. 6, 8, 23 ; ii. 5–7, 20–23 ; iv. 3–4 ; vi. 7–9). The salutations also in iv. 10, 11–14, suppose the Colossians to have been well acquainted with Paul's fellow-travellers and fellow-labourers ; while those contained in the fifteenth and seventeenth verses of the same chapter, prove that the apostle knew the state of the churches in Colossæ and Laodicea.

3. Paul does in effect say that he had himself dispensed the gospel to these Colossians (i. 21–29).

It is remarkable that he does not once allude to the fact of his having founded the church himself. Yet this is stated on other occasions, especially when the members were in danger of being seduced by Judaising teachers from the faith they had been taught ; or when they had already apostatised (compare Gal. i. 6). Even when commending Epaphras to their affectionate regard, the author does not say that *he* had built on the foundation already laid ; or that they should receive his instructions because they coincided with those given by himself. And though various allusions are made to the Colossians having heard the gospel (i. 5, 23), it is never stated that they got it from himself. We admit that the writer shows his anxiety for their state, his knowledge of their circumstances, his familiarity with their belief, and with the progress they had made in divine things ; but he may have been informed of these by Epaphras. If it be remembered, that Paul had the care of all the churches—that he watched over them with parental solicitude though he may not have planted them—the passages supposed to imply personal acquaintance with the Colossians cease to appear strange. He came to know from his fellow-labourers and messengers the peculiar influences to which the converts were exposed.

It was therefore natural that the Colossians should entertain a high veneration for the apostle. They owed their conversion to him indirectly. They had heard of his abundant labours and self-denying zeal on behalf of the Gentiles; and they might look to him as their spiritual father, in consequence of the relation which Epaphras and others sustained to both. The tenor of the epistle implies that the Colossians were converts, disciples, friends; not that they were the author's *immediate* disciples.

4. The Colossians were endowed with spiritual gifts (iii. 16), which they could have received from none but an apostle.

We do not admit the interpretation of iii. 16, which implies the possession of spiritual gifts. The Colossians had not the power of making, but only of singing, spiritual songs; and if this requires a supernatural endowment, every man singing the psalms of David must have a supernatural gift, as Michaelis observes.

5. In ii. 1, 2, we read: 'For I would that ye knew what great conflict I have for you, and for them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh; that *their* hearts might be comforted, being knit together in love,' etc. Here the change of persons implies that the Colossians had seen his face, else the writer would have said *your* not *their*.

According to this interpretation, which is given by Theodoret and Lardner, two classes are specified: first, the inhabitants of Colossæ and Laodicea; secondly, those who had not seen Paul's face. The last clause intimates by contrast, that the Colossians and Laodiceans had seen him personally, especially as the third person (*their* hearts) immediately follows (not *your* hearts).

The pronoun need create no difficulty. In consequence of the preceding word rendered *as many as*, the pronoun is in the third, instead of the second person, the more so as *they of Laodicea* are alluded to in the

same person. The last clause explains the two preceding, pointing to the fact that the Colossians and Laodiceans had not seen his face. On this supposition the clauses have a significance and coherence which Theodoret's explanation destroys. The last is added to show that the apostle's anxiety was not confined to such as were personally known; but that others shared in his solicitude. If the former lay nearer his heart, the latter were not forgotten. Hence the phrase, 'and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh,' is subjoined to express the strength of the writer's inward conflict in relation to such as he had not seen. The whole passage, so far from constituting an argument in favour of Paul's founding the church at Colossæ, has an opposite bearing.

6. The epistle to Philemon affords evidence that Paul had been among the Colossians; for the nineteenth verse implies that Philemon had been converted by him, probably at the home of the former. He also salutes Apphia the wife of Philemon, and Archippus, probably pastor at Colossæ; he desires Philemon to prepare him a lodging; Philemon is styled his fellow-labourer and Archippus his fellow-soldier; all implying personal acquaintance and mutual co-operation in one place, perhaps Colossæ.

The epistle to Philemon does not furnish sufficient evidence that Paul had been present with the Colossians; and he had converted Philemon, not at Colossæ but Ephesus. The salutation of Archippus and his wife by name does not argue previous acquaintance; since Epaphras may have told him of them.

7. Wiggers refers to i. 7, 'As ye have *also* learned of Epaphras,' implying that Epaphras was not their *first* instructor, but that the apostle preceded him in that capacity. The conjunction is expunged from the text by recent editors.

8. The same scholar refers to the verb *I am absent*

(ii. 5), as implying the writer's previous presence. But the verb is contrasted with Paul's *presence in the spirit*: 'Though I be absent in the flesh, yet am I with you in the spirit.'

9. The apostle sends a salutation from Timothy to the Colossians (i. 1), whence the evangelist was known to them. But Timothy travelled with Paul through Phrygia (Acts xvi. 3), without leaving him, as far as we are aware. The apostle, therefore, must also have been known to the Colossians; which is tantamount to saying that he abode in their city and taught them.

It is probable that Timothy had a share in instructing the church. If so, he might well have been in the city without Paul. Even granting that he did not leave the apostle during either of his Phrygian journeys, he might be appropriately joined with him in the salutation, because known to the Colossians by report.

10. The expression 'Epaphras who is one of you,' would not have been applied to this teacher had he founded the church; for the same is said of Onesimus who had been recently converted (iv. 9). In speaking of Epaphras, the apostle never adds 'by whom ye believe,' or 'by whom ye were brought to the fellowship of the gospel.'

Epaphras is described as a native of Colossæ, and therefore he took a special interest in the welfare of his fellow-citizens. What language could be more suited to draw forth the sympathy and affection of the Colossians than that of iv. 12, 13? It is true he is also said to be *one* of the Colossians; but the succeeding contexts distinguish the phrase in its application to Onesimus and to Epaphras.

We believe that the church at Colossæ was planted by Epaphras not Paul. It is strange that so little is said of the former. The apostle styles him *a servant of Christ*; *my fellow-prisoner in Christ Jesus*; *our dear fellow-servant, who is for you a faithful minister of Christ.*

Perhaps he was sent, during the apostle's long abode at Ephesus, to preach in those parts of Asia Minor and Phrygia which Paul could not visit in person. If so, all confidence would be placed in him as teaching the same doctrines and duties with his master.

Though the church was founded by Epaphras, he was not its only teacher. Others assisted him—Archippus, Philemon and Timothy. He is not identical with Epaphroditus, one of the Philippian pastors, as Grotius supposes; though the one name is an abbreviated form of the other.

It is consistent with the view now given, that the writer does not address *the church* at Colossæ, as is done in the epistles to the Thessalonians and Corinthians; nor the saints together with the bishops and deacons, as at the commencement of the Philippian one, but *the saints and faithful brethren.* The language implies, either that they were not formally constituted into a church with elders and deacons; or that another than the apostle addressed them.

The preceding observations assume that the writer was cognisant of the state of the Colossians through fellow-workers, and was none other than Paul himself. But there is a view which separates the author from the apostle, and accounts for his knowledge of the readers by supposing that he personates Paul and addresses the Christians of Colossæ in his name. We shall see by and by the probability of this. If the epistle be post-Pauline, it must present evidences of the fact.

AUTHENTICITY, THEOLOGY, AND DATE.

The authorship of the letter is attested by external evidence. Irenæus writes: 'And again in the epistle to the Colossians (Paul) says; "Luke the beloved physician greets you"' (Coloss. iv. 14).[1]

[1] 'Et iterum in epistola quæ est ad Colossenses, ait: "Salutat vos Lucas, medicus dilectus."'—*Adv. Hæres.* iii. 14, 1, p. 914, ed. Migne.

Clement of Alexandria has these words: 'And in the epistle to the Colossians he (Paul) writes,' etc.[1]

Tertullian has the following: 'From which things the apostle restraining us, expressly cautions against philosophy and vain deceit when he writes to the Colossians, "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men; contrary to the foresight of the Holy Spirit."'[2]

Apparent reminiscences of the letter by Justin Martyr appear both in his 'Dialogue with Trypho' and 'Apologies,' where it is said, 'Christ is *the first-born of all things made, the first-born of God and before all the creatures.*'[3]

It is uncertain, however, whether these expressions were drawn from the epistle, or from the philosophy of Justin's time, along with the Old Testament, the epistle of Clement, and the 'Shepherd' of Hermas. There is no doubt that the letter to the Colossians in which Christ's pre-existence is set forth was written before; but Justin cared little for the apostle's writings, and did not quote them.

Theophilus of Antioch in his treatise to Autolycus writes: 'He begat this emanated word, the first-born of every creature.'[4]

Marcion received the letter into his canon. It is also in the Muratorian list, with the old Latin and Syriac versions.

As far as external evidence goes, the authenticity of

[1] *κἀν τῇ πρὸς* Κολοσσαεῖς *ἐπιστολῇ, νουθετοῦντες, γράφει, κ.τ.λ.—Stromata,* lib. i. p. 277, ed. Colon. 1688.

[2] 'A quibus nos apostolus refrenans, nominatim philosophiam et inanem seductionem contestatus caveri oportere, scribens ad Colossenses: "Videte ne quis sit circumveniens vos per philosophiam et inanem seductionem, secundum traditionem hominum; præter providentiam Spiritus Sancti."'—*De Præscript. Hæret.* vii. pp. 9, 10, vol. ii. ed. Semler.

[3] *ὁ πρωτότοκος τῶν πάντων ποιημάτων, πρωτότοκος μὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως.—Dial. cum Tryph.* ed. Otto, pp. 302, 356, 306, third edition.

[4] *τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ἐγέννησε προφορικόν, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως.—Lib.* ii. p. 100, ed. Colon. 1686.

the epistle is unanimously attested in ancient times. But the fathers of the second and third centuries were more prone to traditional beliefs than critical investigation.

The first thing which arrests the reader's attention is the christology with its polemic tone. This feature points to a Gnostic influence; and the question arises, what is the nature of the Gnosticism which is indirectly combated? Was it incipient or advanced? Did it exist only in germ, or was it developed? Thiersch attempts to bring heretical Gnosis into the apostolic age; and others simply assert its existence at that time; sometimes in language unwarrantably strong. Thus Canon Farrar assures us, that 'traces of doctrines distinctly and systematically Gnostic are found during the apostolic age, such being a matter *of demonstration*.'[1] All that can be allowed is, that Paul's epistles contain the roots of Gnosticism. It did not, however, spring from Paulinism; though it may have found sustenance in the spiritual sense which the apostle found beneath the historical one and took over into his conceptions of Christianity. That the authentic epistles have Gnosticism proper, or that it appeared before the second century, is confronted by opposing evidence. After Paul, whose *Gnosis* centred in the death of Christ as a revelation of the divine plan of salvation, Christian speculation was carried onward by the epistle to the Hebrews, which proceeds on the assumption that Christ is the Logos, and contrasts the visible and invisible, the cosmical and the heavenly, thus preparing the way for the Gnostic distinction between the Spirit-world and the present corporeal one. The ideal sphere to which the epistle transfers the consummation of salvation furnishes a congenial region which the Gnostics peopled with spiritual beings. Upholders of tradition refuse to accept the post-Pauline origin of Gnosticism because it has an im-

[1] *Life and Works of St. Paul*, vol. ii. p. 449.

portant bearing upon the literature of the New Testament, contenting themselves with the simple assertion that Gnosticism is referred to in epistles bearing the names of Paul, John, Jude, and Peter. But Hegesippus says that it began in the reign of Trajan,[1] when the seeds latent till then appeared openly. It is generally allowed that Cerinthus was one of the earliest Gnostics. Can his opinions be pointed at in the epistle? Epiphanius brings him into antagonism with Paul, which is a fabulous view; for neither he nor Irenæus had a clear apprehension of the time and tenets of Cerinthus. Their vague traditions magnified his importance, creating an individuality for him which he did not possess, and confronting him even with apostles. They differ about his opinions in some particulars; while Hippolytus describes one part of his creed otherwise than Irenæus. The so-called heresiarch was not before the end of Trajan's reign, probably some time after; and therefore he cannot be thrown back to A.D. 60–70. Mayerhoff is consistent in rejecting the epistle's authenticity because he sees that it combats the tenets of Cerinthus.

Neander believes that a sect similar to the Cerinthian one, exhibiting the 'germs of a Judaising Gnosticism,' is referred to in the Colossian letter.[2] But the difficulty in putting any Gnostic *sect* into Paul's time, either that of Cerinthus or one of like tendency, is great; and the germs of a Judaising Gnosticism, which the epistle opposes, are too developed to belong so early. Bishop Lightfoot, following Neander, thinks that the Judaic Gnosticism combated was a heresy expressing 'the simplest and most elementary conceptions' of the tendency of thought so called; one whose speculations were so 'vague and fluctuating' as to agree with Paul's time.[3] We shall see, however, that the heretical tenets

[1] Ap. Euseb. *Eccles. Hist.* iii. 32.

[2] *Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung der Christlichen Kirche*, vol. i. pp. 516, 517, vierte Auflage.

[3] *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, pp. 112, 113.

were more than this, as definite as those of Cerinthus, and therefore not so vague as to be capable of transplanting to the apostolic age. We shall see that Lightfoot labours without effect, to date the opinions of the Colossian errorists before A.D. 70; for in doing so he is refuted not only by Hegesippus, who puts the first exhibitions of heretical Gnosis under Trajan, but by Clement of Alexandria, who assigns them to the time of Hadrian, and by Firmilian of Cæsarea, who dates them long after the apostles. He is also refuted by the parallel which Neander draws between Cerinthus and the false teachers —a parallel demonstrating theosophic speculation equally definite. It is not necessary for traditionalists merely to assert that the epistle presupposes no more than the 'elements of Gnostic theory,' 'its simplest and most elementary conceptions;' it is necessary to show that its contents agree with a stage of speculation which had been reached in the lifetime of Paul. The Gnosticism against which the polemic of the epistle is directed may be minimised into seed or germ, but it is still Jewish theosophy which Christian churches in Paul's time did not present; leaven which had corrupted some of the communities in Asia Minor, drawing them away from the doctrine of Paul into metaphysical and mystic speculations which hindered Christ's place in the economy of salvation. Böhmer, who employs the same language as Lightfoot's about these Colossian errorists being 'imbued with some elements of Gnosticism,' finds it necessary to contradict Hegesippus.[1]

The traces of Gnosticism discovered in the New Testament are derived from epistles *assumed* to be Pauline; which is tantamount to the founding of an argument on a basis that needs to be made good. The letters to Timothy, the first of John, with that to the Colossians are appealed to; all lying outside the first century. As to Simon Magus, the notices of him in

[1] *Isagoge in epistolam a Paulo apostolo ad Colossenses datam, etc.* p. 119.

the Acts attribute to him no more than a form of Jewish monotheism; and it is doubtful if Cerinthus himself properly belongs to the Gnostics, because his christology seems to have been Ebionite; though Irenæus holds the reverse.

It is possible to bring Cerinthus into the time of John by accepting Irenæus's tradition about his meeting the apostle; but he cannot be put earlier; and if he be the first representative of *Gnosis falsely so called*,[1] the epistle to the Colossians could not have preceded, because it exhibits theosophic speculation joined with Jewish asceticism in a developed state.

Neander and Nitzsch are probably right in comparing the opinions of Cerinthus with the Colossian errors; for both represent the transition from Essene Ebionitism to Gnosis proper and may therefore be contemporaneous; but that contemporaneousness does not coincide with Paul's time. It is most probable that Cerinthus belonged to the reign of Trajan.

An Essene tendency is combined with the Gnosticism of the epistle; and Christian Essenism did not arise before A.D. 70. This feature alone brings the date below Paul's age. And though the heretical views against which the readers are warned, bear a resemblance to those of Cerinthus, he could not have been specially pointed at because he was not ascetic, though Judaistic.

It is difficult to draw a picture of the Colossian errors because of their mixed origin and theosophic character. Their advocates thought they might be incorporated with Christianity. If they were not Cerinthian neither were they Saturninian, since Saturninus's Gnosticism was not Judaistic. These heretics were rather Ebionite Gnostics like those described by Epiphanius in the thirtieth book of his treatise on heresies,[2]

[1] γνῶσις ψευδώνυμος, pseudonymous gnosis.
[2] § 3.

as Baur perceived.[1] The sacred writer turns against them the current terms of Gnosticism. *Pleroma* (fulness), comprehending the supersensuous world of spirits, carries us directly into the second century. Other words, such as *gnosis* (knowledge), *epignosis* (full knowledge), *sophia* (wisdom), *synesis* (understanding), are chosen with reference to the Gnostic vocabulary, and emphasise certain doctrinal conceptions.

We repeat that the christology of the epistle is the chief feature which points to the Gnostics. In opposition to abstract spiritual beings, the author exhibits the indwelling fulness of the Godhead in the historical Christ who is eternally related to the entire creation; it having been called into existence through him and for him. He is an image and representative of the invisible God, who came forth from His seclusion and entered into relations with the world by him. He is the central being of the universe, its creative and sustaining principle. His absolute pre-eminence above the visible and invisible, including angelic beings of every class, *thrones, dominions, principalities and powers*, is strongly marked. As the full divine life descended upon and dwelt in Him, He also is the head of the body or Christian community, which depends upon Him for its vitality and receives in Him complete salvation. He is the only and perfect mediator, reconciling all to God, bringing together the discordant elements of the universe, and securing to every one the favour of the unseen Father. The antinomies of creation, of heaven and earth, angels and men, Judaism and Christianity, are harmonised in Him, since He bore in himself the full power of the Godhead in order to effect the work of conciliation. Hence asceticism is not needed to deliver mankind from the dominion of sin and the powers of darkness that they may be brought into contact with the spiritual world and receive revelations in it; they have already complete

[1] *Paulus der Apostel Jesu Christi*, pp. 442, 443.

redemption in one who is himself the revelation of God. Believers are put at once into the kingdom of light, and their salvation is accomplished.

This christology rests on a metaphysical basis. Opposed as it is to the angelology and asceticism of the Colossian errorists, it presents a new aspect of Christian theology. The theosophy combated, consisted in speculations about the world of spirits and the worship due to angels. Its advocates affected to penetrate the secrets of the supersensuous world — the ethereal region of angels, where they might receive revelations and enjoy visions—by an ascetic spiritualisation of their persons. Holding matter to be impure and abstaining from fleshly pleasures, they tried to fit their souls for intercourse with the higher region where angels move, and raised themselves up to an ecstatic state in which they might see visions. These speculations hindered a right apprehension of Christ. The mystics in question did not 'hold the head.' They lowered his person and dignity, not beholding in him the perfect and final revelation of God. Whether they ranked him among the angels, or regarded him as a man who had received revelations from angels, is uncertain; but their view of his person was an Ebionite one. To the errorist conception of the pleroma or spirit-world, the writer opposes the person of Jesus Christ, upon whom the pleroma descended, and in whom it dwells *bodily*.[1] The full revelation of the Godhead, including all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, were hid in Him.

The ascetic theosophy of the Colossian errorists had a Judaic stamp. They held the *rudiments of the world*, i.e. the principles of the Mosaic law, with the regulations respecting meats, festivals, new moons, and sabbaths. They were also inclined to circumcision. Hence the writer of the epistle exalts *spiritual* circumcision, re-

[1] On the word σωματικῶς see Böhmer's full exposition, in his *Theologische Auslegung des Paulinischen Sendschreibens an die Colosser*, p. 177, etc.

minding them that their Christian baptism represents the same thing in a higher stage, so that *both* are unnecessary. With such legality their Essene asceticism prompted them to discountenance marriage,[1] and to select certain drinks. By mortifying the body they sought to free themselves from the grossness of matter. They resembled those who are called *weak* in the 14th chapter of the epistle to the Romans; though they were not the same.

The sentiments expressed in the epistle, especially in the first two chapters, do not agree with those of Paul. With some resemblance to his, they go beyond them. Thus although Christ's agency in the creation of the world appears in both, He is here said to be *the ultimate end* of creation. Not only are all things by Him, but they are in Him and for Him; whereas Paul makes Christ resign dominion, that God himself may be all in all. While the apostle dwells on the dignity and power of one exalted to the right hand of the Father, the writer of the epistle insists upon the permanent bearing of the divine fulness by the earthly Christ. It is also ultra-Pauline to say that all things *cohere in Him*, or that He is the cosmic principle of the universe. Instead of Christ's pre-eminence being subordinate, as with Paul, it is here a central dogma. The perfect representative of the unseen God differs from the spiritual, heavenly man, or exalted Christ of the apostle. Philo's doctrine of the Logos bears a close resemblance to that of the epistle, as Köstlin has shown.[2]

Again, Christ is termed the head of *the body*; in other words the community of Christians depends entirely on Him; an idea based on his metaphyiscal place in the universe. This differs from the true Pauline conception of his being the *first-born*, or the *first*

[1] *Touch not* (ii. 21) is an expression applied to marriage in 1 Corinthians vii. 1.

[2] *Der Lehrbegriff des Evang. und der Briefe Johannis*, p. 357.

fruits in relation to the resurrection. Besides, the historical Christ presented in our epistle bearing in himself the fulness of the Godhead, and effecting complete reconciliation, is unlike the Pauline idea of his earthly life being one of humiliation and emptiness.

As to the atonement itself, the Pauline theory is that *God* is reconciled as well as man. His enmity has to be removed, his justice satisfied. In our epistle, God procures reconciliation for us, without respect to His punitive justice. Instead of man being delivered from the divine wrath, he is released from the power of the devil and his kingdom. The reconciliation is twofold as in Paul's writings; but the present epistle puts the hostile spiritual world in place of God's anger.

Redemption is explained by the forgiveness of sins in i. 14. It is a subjective thing, a conscious state of freedom from guilt obtained by faith in communion with Christ. With Paul, redemption is God's way of delivering man from His just anger by the sacrifice of Christ, in consequence of which the sinner is not only acquitted but declared righteous. The righteousness of Christ being imputed to him, he acquires a consciousness of forgiveness and peace of mind. The objective divine act is absent from our epistle. The word *justify* does not appear. The writer's thoughts move in another atmosphere than the legal one of the Pauline phraseology. Redemption is simply forgiveness of sins, subjective not objective; an internal relation to God not preceded by an external divine act.

In Paul's writings, the kingdom of God is not called the kingdom of Christ, as here (i. 13); nor is baptism the Christian counterpart of circumcision. The idea of their correspondence as type and antitype is peculiar. Both symbolise the putting away of the flesh. Baptism is the being buried with Christ, a mystical appropriation of his death which brings with it a new spiritual life.

The present epistle looks upon the sufferings of

Paul not only as a participation in those of Christ, but a supplementing or filling up of them for the good of the spiritual body. This idea differs from that of Paul, as appears from a comparison of i. 24 with 2 Cor. i. 5. That Christ's sufferings were incomplete and their measure added to, is a conception which cannot be harmonised with any Pauline one.

In the epistles of Paul, redemption is not extended to heavenly beings, as it is here. Reconciliation is effected between God and man only. But in the Colossian epistle, the effect of Christ's cross is exceedingly comprehensive. It brings together heaven and earth, angels and men, the antagonisms of the universe. Concrete unity grows out of opposites.

The repeated assurance that Paul is a servant of the gospel and the church is peculiar (i. 23, 25). Why should this phrase appear in verses close together? Is it not unlike the apostle's manner?

The theology of the epistle is manifestly post-Pauline, approaching that of the fourth gospel. Though not exactly parallel, it moves in the sphere of the Johannine writings, forming an intermediate link between Pauline and Johannine ideas. The term *Logos* does not occur; but the metaphysical conception of Christ's nature is the same as that of the prologue to the fourth gospel. After primitive Ebionism had yielded to incipient Gnosticism, efforts were made towards *unity* in the faith. The writer confronts the Ebionism current in Asia Minor with a conciliatory Pauline tendency, and his christology is the echo of a Gnosticism by which the Judaistic asceticism that had grown into it might be removed. His metaphysical christology is at once the offspring and counterpoise of an Ebionite Gnosticism derogatory to the perfection of Christ and his redemption. The apprehension of Him as mediator between God and man in the work of salvation passes from a lower to a higher stage; He is the

revealer of the unseen Deity, the central being in the universe, in whom all antagonisms cease. *Universal reconciliation* is complete in Him. It is therefore natural to find similarity between the Logos of John and the metaphysical nature assigned to Christ in our epistle. There are also points of contact between the writer's ideas and those of the epistle to the Hebrews. Both have that Alexandrian dualism of the two worlds which appears in advanced Paulinism. Sometimes the language is nearly identical, as when Christ is called 'an image of the invisible God,' like 'an express image of his substance;' or when the law is termed the 'shadow of things to come,' as in Hebrews x. 1. The author shapes another Gnosticism out of that which was current in Asia Minor and Alexandrian ideas, to supplant Christian Essenism, to restore the apostle's authority among the Phrygian Christians, and make his doctrine the broad basis of a catholic church in which Paulinism and Gnosticism should merge. In doing so, he steps beyond the master, co-ordinating instead of subordinating the Son to the Father. The metaphysical christology of the epistle stands out as a strong proof of post-Paulinism.

We are now prepared to find an absence of words and phrases peculiarly Pauline. The antithesis of *faith* and *law* does not appear. The word *justify*, as has been already remarked, is absent. The first two chapters, or rather the first and part of the second, have a stiff and broken style, without ease or freedom. The language moves along heavily, not in finished clauses or in sentences connected by the usual particles, but in a series of co-ordinate statements joined by participial forms and relative pronouns, or by causal and inferential conjunctions. Such particles as ἄρα, ἄρα οὖν, διό, διότι, γάρ are rare; though they belong to the Pauline vocabulary and suit his rapid argumentation. (Compare ii. 9–15.) In the doctrinal part logical order is

wanting. The unsystematic succession of ideas is weakened by repetition, and labours under awkward expressions. The manner is loose and tautological, without spring or vivacity; while Paul's dialectic usually hastens to a definite result in the shortest way, neglecting grammatical construction and overleaping intermediate ideas.

Among the peculiar words or phrases of the epistle are *the Lord Christ* (iii. 24); *Greek and Jew* for the Pauline *Jew and Greek* (iii. 11); φανερο῀ν (iii. 4) applied to the second coming of Christ; ὅς or ὅ ἐστιν (i. 24–27) nearly equivalent to *videlicet*; and various new compounds.[1] These may be of slight weight in an anti-Pauline scale if taken separately; they are not so along with other phenomena. The style of the first and second chapters excites most suspicion from its dissimilarity to Paul's.

Notwithstanding the proofs of un-Pauline authorship, some scholars think them insufficient, because new circumstances may have stimulated the apostle's mind and raised it to higher aspects of Christ's person. As his intellect was not exempt from the law of growth, he may have apprehended the gospel in a clearer form and reached a greater insight into the Son's relation to the universe. It is unreasonable to confine him to one circle of ideas and expressions. A polemic reference may have called forth peculiar sentiments respecting Christ's relation to the spirit world, with his all-pervading presence and power. The apostle may have seen the necessity of developing his usual doctrine because of the errors which undermined it.

It may be doubted whether this reasoning has sufficient force to counteract the anti-Pauline arguments already adduced. We admit that it is unphilosophical

[1] As πιθανολογία, ἐθελοθρησκεία, αἰσχρολογία, προσηλο῀ν, συλαγωγε῀ν, χειρόγραφον, ἀνταναπληρο῀ν, εἰρηνοποιει῀ν, κ.τ.λ. A list of the words peculiar to the epistle is given by Zeller, in the *Tübingen Zeitschrift*, vol. ii. pp. 506, 507.

to stereotype the apostle's mind. But when one compares all his writings, including the latest, with the present epistle, and sees their important differences in ideas and language, it is difficult to maintain identity of authorship. The distinctions are too wide to allow room for it. Nothing is left but separate persons and times to explain them. The writer of the epistle was a Pauline Christian, living in Asia Minor long after the apostle; the Gnostic period had begun; the older Christianity had been invaded by new speculations, so that he needed to push forward and mould the prior doctrine to make it effectual in supplanting error. Ebionite Gnosticism had to be overcome by another doctrine than Paul's—one of a sweep wide enough to embrace the pleroma and do away with it as an abstract thing by connecting it with Christ. This new doctrine could not have been got without the Alexandrian philosophy of the time. With all his ability, however, the author did not stop the Gnostic current in Phrygia, because the national character was tinged with a mystic enthusiasm. The Phrygians were prone to speculation respecting the invisible world. Ebionite Gnosticism was the precursor of Montanism.

We assume that the erroneous sentiments combated belonged to one class of persons without being distributed among separate parties. Colossæ was comparatively small, and the Christians in it were not numerous. The Gentile false teachers belonged to the Church; for no distinction is made between the promoters of the erroneous doctrines and the general body of believers. Perhaps the leaven had not penetrated the Church deeply, though it was an influence that needed serious opposition, because the Pauline faith could not be retained in connection with it. The worship of angels and ascetic striving after immediate communion with the spirit-world detracted from the perfect mediatorship and finished salvation of Christ; a concentration of the

pleroma in him instead of its diffusion over all the upper world, nullified such theosophy.

Since the discussions of Baur and Schwegler, which received their impetus from Mayerhoff, some critics discover a mixed character in the epistle. Hitzig supposes that it is an authentic Pauline letter revised by the author of that to the Ephesians—an opinion ingeniously presented and well supported by Holtzmann. On the other hand, Pfleiderer thinks that it was prior to the Ephesian letter and from a different hand; but agrees with Holtzmann in holding it to have been retouched by a later writer. Finding it truly Pauline in the beginning and practical part, he discovers the groundwork in the doctrinal statements of the first two chapters.[1] But though he supports his opinion by acute criticism, we are unable to adopt the revisal-theory. Pfleiderer is right in separating the author of the Ephesian epistle altogether from his predecessor of the Colossian one, and in thinking that some parts resemble the apostle's manner. But was not the position of an epistle that proceeded from his pen too well established after the lapse of fifty years to suffer metamorphosis from a professed follower? Ewald's view that Timothy, receiving the matter from Paul, wrote the greater part of the first two chapters, the apostle taking the pen into his own hand before the conclusion, is improbable.[2] The doctrine goes beyond the apostle; and Timothy never acted as his secretary. Un-Pauline phenomena cannot be disposed of in that way.

The date of the epistle and locality of the writer are not ascertainable with certainty. The stage of Gnosticism presupposed is not an advanced one, so that the origin is scarcely later than A.D. 130. Probably the letter was written about 120 A.D., in Asia Minor, perhaps in Phrygia itself. As it did not proceed from the

[1] See his *Paulinism*, vol. ii. of English translation, p. 99.

[2] *Die Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, p. 469.

apostle, the conflicting claims of Cæsarea and Rome for the place of writing need not be considered. The immediate occasion is said to have been the intelligence which Epaphras brought the writer respecting the affairs of the church at Colossæ; and the reputed bearer was Tychicus, who accompanied Onesimus returning to his master.

It has no allusion to the fact that Colossæ had recently suffered from an earthquake. According to Tacitus, the neighbouring Laodicea was destroyed in the seventh year of Nero, A.D. 61; and Eusebius says, that the earthquake affected Hierapolis and Colossæ as well.

CONTENTS.

The epistle may be divided into two parts: the first chiefly doctrinal, the latter practical: chapters i., ii., and iii., iv.

After the salutation, the author expresses his thanks to God for the faith and love of the Colossian believers, and his unceasing prayer on their behalf, that they might be filled with the knowledge of the Divine will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding, so as to walk worthy of the Lord and well pleasing in his sight; abounding in good deeds, for which they were strengthened by the power of God working in them. He again expresses his thanks to God the Father, who had prepared him and the Colossians for the heavenly inheritance, since they had been delivered from the kingdom of ignorance and translated into the spiritual kingdom of the Son, through whose blood alone complete redemption is obtained. The mention of Christ and his atonement leads to a description of his person and dignity. He is an image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation, the upholder of all beings and things in the universe, the head of the church, the first-begotten of the dead, having pre-eminence over spiritual

intelligences and renewed humanity. As Lord over all, he is said to have reconciled all things and the Colossians also, divested of their former enmity, that if they continued steadfast in the faith they might be presented faultless in the immediate presence of the Almighty (i. 1–23).

The writer expresses his joy in the office he had been called to, notwithstanding all his sufferings, because these very sufferings tended to promote the progress and subserve the completeness of the universal Church. In discharging the duties of his ministry, he states that he had to preach the gospel fully, to instruct and warn all men both Jews and Gentiles, and to present every one perfect in Christ. For this he laboured earnestly, especially for the believers at Colossæ and as many as had not seen his face. He entertained for them great solicitude, that they might be established and knit together in love, being fully assured of the mystery of God—the Divine purpose of blessing mankind in that Saviour who possesses in himself all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. He then proceeds to warn them against a deceitful philosophy grounded on human authority and not derived from Christ. In opposition to it, he reminds them that all the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in Christ bodily; and that they themselves had been spiritually quickened by his grace, having being delivered from the yoke of legal observances. Hence they should not be seduced from the gospel by a pretended wisdom which affected intercourse with angels and spirits, enjoined ceremonial observances, abstinence from meats and drinks, and an ascetic neglect of the body (i. 24–ii. 23).

He now passes to general precepts, in which the readers are exhorted to be heavenly-minded, to withdraw their affections from sinful objects, to crucify the lusts of the flesh, to lay aside such practices as they had once indulged in, and to be furnished with the virtues

of a renewed nature. They are admonished, above all, to have the love and peace of God ruling in their hearts, to edify one another in their mutual intercourse, giving thanks at all times to God the Father who had created them anew (iii. 1–17). Various directions relating to domestic life are subjoined, such as the duties of husbands and wives, parents and children, servants and masters; followed by an exhortation to continued prayer combined with watchfulness; prayer in particular for the author's release, that he might be at full liberty to preach the gospel. For information about his affairs he refers them to Tychicus, the bearer of the letter; and to Onesimus, of whom he speaks with affection. The closing verses contain salutations to various individuals, and an injunction to have the present epistle read before the Laodicean church, while the epistle sent to Laodicea should also be read in the church at Colossæ. The author concludes by subscribing the letter with his own hand (iii. 18–iv. 18).

THE EPISTLE FROM LAODICEA.

In iv. 16 it is written, 'And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; *and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea.*'

The last clause has been understood in two ways, either that an epistle was written at and sent from Laodicea, or that an epistle was sent by Paul to the Laodiceans.

1. The preposition *from*[1] is urged as pointing to the source of the letter but is not decisive. The verb *cause*[2] in the context favours another opinion, viz. that the Colossians were *to procure* it *from* Laodicea, not that it had been *composed* there. Why should it be recommended to the Colossians to read a letter of

[1] ἐκ. [2] ποιήσατε.

Laodicean origin addressed to the writer, when they had received his to them, embodying whatever was necessary ?

2. The only tenable interpretation is, that the words refer to an epistle written to Laodicea and sent thence to the Colossians. According to the author's injunction, a letter addressed to the Colossians was to be read in the church of the Laodiceans ; a letter addressed to the Laodiceans was to be forwarded by them to the Colossians.

The epistle in question has been lost. One is extant in the Latin language, purporting to be the Laodicean, which Elias Hutter translated into Greek. It is plainly a forgery made up of passages taken from the epistles to the Philippians and Colossians. Anger has edited it ;[1] so has Bishop Lightfoot.

We need not discuss opinions of those who identify the Laodicean with an extant canonical epistle : either with the epistle to the Hebrews, as Schulthess does ; or with that to Philemon, as Wieseler argues ; or with that to the Ephesians. The reasons adduced in favour of these views are insufficient. The last is the most plausible, because it is seemingly supported by a statement to the effect that Marcion called what is now the epistle to the Ephesians, *to the Laodiceans*—which statement agrees with the words in the Muratorian fragment, 'fertur etiam ad Laodicenses alia.'

The hypothesis has been a favourite one since Mill and Wetstein propounded it. It tallies with the opinion that the epistle to the Ephesians was a circular one, despatched from Ephesus through several places to Laodicea, whence it was to reach Colossæ. But it is difficult to understand why two similar epistles should be addressed to neighbouring cities ; or why salutations should be sent to Laodiceans in the Colossian epistle, instead of in that directed to themselves.

[1] *Ueber den Laodicenerbrief*, 1843.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

EPHESUS AND ITS FIRST CONNECTION WITH THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

EPHESUS, one of the most celebrated cities of Ionia in Asia Minor, was situated on the river Cayster, not far from the seacoast, between Smyrna and Miletus. After falling into the hands of the Romans, it became the metropolis of proconsular Asia; and was famous as a place of commerce; still more so as the chief seat of the worship of the goddess Artemis, whose splendid temple stood not far from the harbour Panormus. This structure having been burnt by Herostratus on the night when Alexander the Great was born (B.C. 355), a new and more magnificent one was reared, which was reckoned one of the seven wonders of the world. Pliny[1] gives a description of its dimensions.

The apostle Paul visited the place on his second missionary journey, as he returned from Corinth with Aquila and Priscilla. He did not, however, remain in it, but left those companions who instructed Apollos in the true faith (Acts xviii. 19, etc.). On his third journey, he revisited the city and abode there two years and three months, preaching first in the synagogue, and then in the school of Tyrannus.

A church was formed, mainly from among those who had received John's baptism.

[1] *Hist. Nat.* xxxvi. 21; xvi. 79.

Great success attended his labours at Ephesus; so that the inhabitants became alarmed for the worship of Artemis, and stirred up a tumult which could scarcely be quelled (xix. 23–41). At his departure he is supposed to have left Timothy there (1 Tim. i. 3), whom ecclesiastical tradition makes the first bishop of Ephesus. Subsequently, Tychicus is said to have brought a letter to the Ephesians, written in Paul's captivity (Ephes. vi. 21). A well-known tradition states that the apostle John lived and laboured at Ephesus in his latter days; and that after returning from exile in Patmos he died there at a great age. His grave, together with that of the Lord's mother, was pointed out in the time of the Crusades. The place became the seat of a bishop; and two famous synods were held there, A.D. 431, 449.

THE PERSONS TO WHOM THE LETTER WAS ADDRESSED.

Was it written to the Ephesians?

External evidence in favour of the epistle's address to the church at Ephesus is strong. All MSS. and ancient versions have 'in Ephesus' in the first verse, except the Sinaitic and Vatican, the former of which omits it, while the latter has it in the margin from a second hand.

The testimony of the fathers also favours the reading in question, but with some drawbacks.

'Origen says, "In the case of the Ephesians alone we meet with the expression, *the saints who are*, and ask, unless that additional phrase be redundant, what it can mean. See then whether those who have been partakers of His nature who revealed himself to Moses in Exodus by the name *I am*, may not from such union be designated as 'those who are' called out of a state of non-being as it were into that of being." This Alexandrian father tries to explain the commencement

of the epistle without the words 'in Ephesus,' which were not in his copy.[1]

Basil the Great says: 'And writing to the Ephesians as truly united by knowledge to Him who is, he called them in a peculiar sense those *who are*, saying, "To the saints *who are*, and the faithful in Christ Jesus." For so those before us have transmitted it, and we have found it in the ancient copies.'[2] The author refers to the reading *in Ephesus*, asserting that the verse in which it occurs had been received from his predecessors without the words; and that he had found it so in ancient copies.

Jerome's language implies that *both* readings existed in his day. 'Some are of opinion, from what was said to Moses, "Thou shalt say to the children of Israel *he who is* has sent me" (Exod. iii. 14), that the saints and faithful at Ephesus were also designated by a term denoting essence, so that . . . they are called *those who are* from *him who is*. This is an over-refined speculation. Others suppose that he wrote not *to those who are*, but *to those who are saints and faithful at Ephesus*.'[3] Jerome adopts the received reading, 'in Ephesus;' and censures the forced interpretation based on the want of those words.

Tertullian writes thus: 'I here pass by another

[1] *Ὡριγένης δέ φησι, Ἐπὶ μόνων Ἐφεσίων εὕρομεν κείμενον τὸ 'τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι·' καὶ ζητοῦμεν, εἰ μὴ παρέλκει προσκείμενον τὸ 'τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι,' τί δύναται σημαίνειν; ὅρα οὖν εἰ μὴ ὥσπερ ἐν τῇ Ἐξόδῳ ὄνομά φησιν ἑαυτοῦ ἃ χρηματίζων Μωσεῖ τὸ Ὢν οὕτως οἱ μετέχοντες τοῦ ὄντος γίνονται 'ὄντες' καλούμενοι οἱονεὶ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι εἰς τὸ εἶναι.*—Cramer's *Catena in Ephes.* i. 1, vol. vi. p. 102.

[2] *ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς Ἐφεσίοις ἐπιστέλλων ὡς γνησίως ἡνωμένοις τῷ ὄντι δι' ἐπιγνώσεως, ὄντας αὐτοὺς ἰδιαζόντως ὠνόμασεν, εἰπών· τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· οὕτω γὰρ οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν παραδεδώκασι, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντιγράφων εὑρήκαμεν.*—*Contra Eunomium.* *Opp.* tom. i. p. 254, ed. Garnier.

[3] 'Quidam, curiosius quam necesse est, putant ex eo quod Mosi dictum sit: "Hæc dices filiis Israel, *qui est* misit me, etiam eos qui Ephesi sunt sancti et fideles, essentiæ vocabulo nuncupatos ut . . . . ab eo *qui est*, hi *qui sunt* appellentur. Alii vero simpliciter non ad eos *qui sunt* sed qui *Ephesi* sancti et fideles *sunt*, scriptum arbitrantur."'—*Ad Ephes.* i. 1.

epistle which *we* have inscribed to the Ephesians; *heretics* to the Laodiceans.'[1]

Again: 'According to the true testimony of the church, we suppose that epistle to have been sent to the Ephesians, not to the Laodiceans. But Marcion sometimes inclined to alter the title, as if he had made very diligent inquiry into the matter. Yet the title is of no importance, since the apostle wrote to all when he wrote to some.'[2]

These words show that Tertullian believed the epistle to be rightly inscribed to the Ephesians; but that Marcion and his followers called it the epistle to the Laodiceans, and wished to alter the title accordingly. The word *titulus* (title), which Tertullian uses, means directly and primarily the running title prefixed, but includes in his view the salutation of the letter itself. Because Marcion wished to falsify the title by reading 'to the Laodiceans,' he also wished to omit 'in Ephesus' from the text of i. 1, putting '*to the Laodiceans*' instead. The one step led to the other, so that *title* comprehends both.

The Muratorian canon gives the title *to the Ephesians*; which is also attested by Clement of Alexandria. The testimony of Ignatius need not be pressed into the argument for or against the received reading. In the twelfth chapter of his epistle to the Ephesians (shorter recension), Ignatius calls them 'the companions of Paul the blessed, the martyred, in the mysteries of the gospel,' adding, 'who throughout all his epistles makes mention of you in Christ Jesus.'[3] Michaelis translates the words of Ignatius 'in the whole epistle' (literally in

[1] 'Prætereo hic et de alia epistola quam nos ad Ephesios perscriptam habemus, hæretici vero ad Laodicenos.'—*Adv. Marcion.* v. 11.

[2] 'Ecclesiæ quidem veritate epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam non ad Laodicenos; sed Marcion ei titulum aliquando interpolare gestiit, quasi et in isto diligentissimus explorator. Nihil autem de titulis interest, cum ad omnes apostolus scripserit dum ad quosdam.'—*Adv. Marcion.* v. 17.

[3] Παύλου συμμύσται τοῦ ἡγιασμένου . . . ὃς ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ μνημονεύει ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.—*Ad Ephes.* c. xii.

every part of his letter'), i.e. in a particular epistle which the Ephesians had received from Paul, the one now extant. Credner, however, relies as strongly as Michaelis on the same Ignatian epistle to show that the letter was not addressed to the Ephesians alone ;[1] improperly so, as Lünemann has proved.[2] The various recensions of the Ignatian epistle in this very passage, render the witness of no weight on either side. The twelfth chapter is wanting in the Syriac copy.

External evidence is adverse to the fact that the words *in Ephesus* were absent from most early copies. It is also opposed to the opinion that *in Laodicea* stood in place of them at first. The question may be facilitated by inquiring if the first verse gives a good sense without *in Ephesus*. It is possible that the Greek may mean 'to the saints that are (truly such) and the faithful in Christ Jesus ;' or, with Hofmann, 'to the saints who are also believers in Christ Jesus ;' but these translations are improbable. The apostle always puts the place where the saints reside.

Internal evidence in favour of the Ephesians as the persons to whom the apostle wrote is not equally strong, or rather it points the other way.

1. In i. 15 we read, 'Wherefore I also, after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love unto all the saints.' Such language excludes the idea of personal and familiar intercourse. The writer had *heard* of their faith in the Lord Jesus and love to all the saints. He speaks of the first hearing of their faith not of its continuance and progress, as appears from the subsequent context. The alleged parallel in the fifth verse of Philemon does not neutralise the force of the words as evidence for the writer's unacquaintedness with those addressed; '*hearing* of thy faith and love which thou hast toward the Lord

[1] *Einleitung in das N. T.*, pp. 395, 396. The longer recension has a different reading from the shorter one.

[2] *De epistolæ quam Paulus ad Ephesios dedisse perhibetur authentia, primis lectoribus, argumento summo ac consilio*, p. 38.

Jesus and toward all saints,' because it is dissimilar. Not to mention the different tenses of the verb in both,[1] the case of one simply converted and sent away by Paul is very different from that of persons converted and personally instructed by the apostle for three years.

2. 'If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God, which is given me to you-ward. How that by revelation He made known to me the mystery; (as I wrote afore in few words; whereby when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ.) (iii. 2, 3.) Here the word *if* is equivalent to 'supposing that,' not to *since* or *forasmuch as*; and the passage plainly shows, that the apostle himself was not the person from whom they heard of the thing. Had he laboured among the Ephesians, they must have known his apostolic calling without needing to be told of it in a letter. Did they require to 'understand his knowledge in the mystery of Christ,' if he taught them three years?

3. 'If so be that ye have heard him and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus' (iv. 21). This passage is parallel to the preceding, and justifies the same conclusion, viz. that the readers had not been instructed by Paul in person.

4. The epistle contains no salutation to the members of the church at Ephesus, though the apostle must have been intimate with many after his three years' abode among them. The case of the Roman church is not parallel, because the chapter containing the salutations is not an authentic part of the epistle; and if it were, it does not follow that if the apostle had many friends in a place he had not seen, he had no friends worthy of salutation in a locality where he had spent years. It does not remove this difficulty to say, with Lardner, that Tychicus, the bearer of the letter, could tell the church of all things and supply the place of personal salutations from Paul: because such as carried epistles

[1] *ἀκούσας* in Ephesians; *ἀκούων* in Philemon.

in other instances did not make written greetings unnecessary. We admit that it was not Paul's universal practice to insert salutations at the end of his epistles, as appears from those to the Galatians and Thessalonians. But his close connection with the Ephesians for so long a time makes the absence of salutations peculiarly striking, much more so than in the case of the first letter to the Corinthians, written to a church he had founded, but where he had not resided so long. Let it not be said that he was less disposed to select persons for affectionate remembrance in proportion to his intimate knowledge of those to whom he wrote, for that is not the fact; and if it were, it would not accord with human nature. When it is also urged in explanation of the anomaly, that circumstances were greatly changed since Paul had been at Ephesus; that six years' absence must have lessened the number of his personal friends or removed them altogether; that he avoided all allusion to former painful circumstances at Ephesus; such assumptions are mere shifts to explain a difficulty, and one of them is obviously incorrect, for six years had not elapsed since he was there, and a later generation could not have sprung up. He was last at Ephesus in A.D. 57 or 58; and the epistle, if authentic, must have been written between that date and A.D. 62. The apostle was not forgetful of his friends though absent from them for years; nor would he have thought of omitting to mention any because of their possible removal. Though the epistle has been submitted to the closest scrutiny, little has been found to supply the place of personal allusions. It is doubtful if the thought of evil spirits working in the invisible regions was suggested by the exorcising of evil spirits and the use of magical formularies mentioned in the Acts (xix.). Some coincidences of language between the address to the elders at Miletus and that of the epistle are so slight as to prove nothing. The strange fact still re-

mains, that in writing to a church with which he was as personally intimate as with any other, no reference is made to particular members, or to special circumstances affecting it.

5. Timothy's name is not associated with Paul's in the salutation at the beginning, though he was no stranger to the church at Ephesus. Lardner's opinion that he was not at Rome but Ephesus when the apostle wrote the present letter, is conjectural. Absence from Rome on a temporary mission is easily conjured up for a purpose.

6. According to the Acts of the Apostles, the church at Ephesus consisted of Jews and Gentiles (xix. 8–10, 17); in what proportion it is difficult to say; but the Jewish element probably preponderated (Acts xviii.). Yet the letter is addressed to Gentiles (ii., iii., iv. 17, 22), and bears no trace of Jewish readers, not even in ii. 15. It is a mere assertion that the distinction between Jew and Gentile should pass into the background in the present epistle. Why? Is it because the mysteries of the gospel are prominently adduced? Is it because the universal Church is described in all its characteristics? Neither of these justifies an exclusive reference to Gentiles. Even if the conflict between the two parties had passed away, which it had not in the time of Paul, it is scarcely possible that the Jewish Christians in the Ephesian church would have been unnoticed.

Pressed by the weight of these considerations, which Meyer vainly tries to overcome, many have had recourse to the hypothesis that the letter was *encyclical*, i.e. that it was intended for various churches in Asia Minor. The modifications of this opinion are numerous, some thinking that an empty space was left to be filled up in the first verse instead of *in Ephesus*, either by the writer himself or Tychicus, as each church received a copy; or by Tychicus, alone at his discretion. The hypothesis does not remove the difficulty, and is at best an artificial expedient of modern origin. Started by Ussher, it con-

tinues among the advocates of the letter's authenticity down to the present day. In circular epistles like those of Peter and James no blank space was left to be filled; and at the commencement of the Galatian letter, which was designed for the use of several churches, the country is specified. Analogy, therefore, would lead us to expect *in Asia*, after *the saints that are* (i. 1). Besides, why should the writer put a general address, when he meant special communities? Were they all in the predicament of persons who might or might not have heard of his apostolic calling and knowledge of Christianity? Could he praise the faith and love of the believers in a number of churches? There is little doubt that a definite circle of readers is implied in i. 15, 16; ii. 11–19; iii. 1; iv. 20.

Believing that the words *in Ephesus* proceeded from the writer himself, we cannot hold the encyclical character of the letter. Why was it commonly inscribed *to the Ephesians* if it were intended for a wider circle? Is it because the circle consisted of the church at Ephesus as the central one, with smaller bodies in its neighbourhood? As long as Ephesus be retained as a usual reading, and the church there be included in the circle of readers, it is impossible to account for the language used in various places—language excluding intimacy between the author and his readers. True it is, that a few years had elapsed since Paul was among them, and that considerable changes must have taken place in that time, both in the number of persons he had known and the extension of the church beyond Ephesus itself. But this is insufficient to account for such expressions as those of i. 15; iii. 2–4; iv. 21. Were his friends all dead? Could he suppose them wholly gone, and conjure up a community most of whom were strangers to him? The extension of the church beyond the limits of the city itself could not make him refrain from the specific and deal with what was general; rather would the specific of the Ephesian church proper ex-

clude the general; though the latter might be more applicable to the added portions of the Christian community or communities. The encyclical nature of the epistle fails to satisfy the required conditions of the case, being out of harmony both with the usual title of the epistle and its contents. The only plausible room for it is in the assumption that the church at Ephesus did not belong to the circle intended.

It is a more plausible hypothesis that the present epistle was addressed to the Laodiceans, in its encyclical character. It would be first read at Ephesus, and go out thence to the other Asiatic churches, among them to that of Laodicea. When therefore the writer requests the Colossians to read the 'epistle from Laodicea,' he means the Ephesian one. The testimony of Marcion is adduced for this view. According to Tertullian, that reputed heretic entitled this epistle, *to the Laodiceans*, i.e. he inserted that title in the blank space left at the beginning to be filled up with the addresses of various churches. Epiphanius, however, does not agree with Tertullian on this point. According to him, the canon of Marcion had the epistle with its usual title. Yet he afterwards confirms Tertullian's opinion that Marcion called it 'the epistle to the Laodiceans.'

The Muratorian fragment, after enumerating the epistles, speaks of one to the Laodiceans forged in the name of Paul to favour Marcion's heresy. This seems to have had no connection with the epistle to the Laodiceans.

Much stress has been laid upon Marcion's testimony by the advocates of the encyclical theory. It is assumed that he gave the address on critical grounds; and that Tertullian's *interpolare* implies the filling up of a blank space in the MS. of the epistle. The exact words of the African father should not be insisted on, as he was neither accurate nor fair to opponents. All that Tertullian says is, that Marcion sometimes desired to

interpolate in it the title, *to the Ephesians*; and this title may have been the inscription, not an insertion in the text of the first verse. Whatever was the view of Marcion, Tertullian believed that he tampered with the true title. It is as likely that Marcion inferred from Coloss. iv. 16, that the Ephesian epistle was addressed to the Laodiceans, as that he found a blank space in the MSS. of it. One thing is clear, that the general evidence of its being an Ephesian epistle, not an encyclical one, belongs to the second and third centuries, anterior to the oldest existing MSS. That of the Muratorian Canon and Tertullian is nearly two hundred years prior to ℵ and B.

We cannot but believe that the common reading is authentic, in accordance with overwhelming external evidence; and that the title is consequently correct. The letter was addressed to the Ephesians, not to the Laodiceans and others; it was specific not encyclical.

What is to be said of its contents? They disagree with the Pauline authorship. The difficulties inherent in the belief that Paul wrote the letter are insuperable, and the omission of the disputed words *in Ephesus* at an early period, may have arisen out of them. Marcion probably felt them; and suggested another title, *to the Laodiceans*. Ussher felt them and supposed that the letter was encyclical.

AUTHENTICITY.

Antiquity is agreed in assigning the epistle to Paul. Polycarp alludes to it: 'As it is expressed in these Scriptures: "Be ye angry, and sin not;" and, "Let not the sun go down upon your wrath"' (Ephes. iv. 26).[1]

Here Ephes. iv. 26 is joined to a quotation from the

[1] *καθὼς ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς εἴρηται, ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε· καὶ ὁ ἥλιος μὴ ἐπιδύετο ἐπὶ τῷ παροργισμῷ ὑμῶν.—Ep. ad Philipp.* xii.

4th Psalm (verse 4), and the term *Scripture* inexactly applied to both, whereas the author meant it solely for the Old Testament citation, according to the view entertained in his day. Or he may have supposed that the phrase belonging to the Ephesian epistle was part of the Old Testament. A passage in the 1st chapter also shows acquaintance with our epistle, where Ephes. ii. 8 was in the writer's mind. The same remark applies to words in the 4th chapter, which show a reminiscence of Ephes. vi. 11.

A passage in Ignatius has been already quoted. In addition to it, the first chapter of his letter to the Ephesians contains an obvious reminiscence of Ephes. v. 2. The sixth chapter of his letter to Polycarp also shows acquaintance with Ephes. vi. 11, etc.

Tertullian's testimony has been adduced already.

The work was in Marcion's canon, the Muratorian list, with the old Latin and Syriac versions.

Irenæus is the first who expressly names Paul as author: 'Even as the blessed Paul says in his epistle to the Ephesians, that "we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones."'[1] In another place he writes: 'Therefore Paul the apostle said: "one God the Father, who is above all, and through all, and in us all"' (Ephes. iv. 6).[2]

Clement of Alexandria says: 'Wherefore also he writes in the epistle to the Ephesians, "Be ye subject one to another in the fear of God,"' etc.[3] In another work he says: 'Writing to the Ephesians he has most clearly unfolded that which is sought for in this manner: "Till we all come into the unity of faith and

[1] *καθὼς ὁ μακάριος Παῦλός φησιν, ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους ἐπιστολῇ· ὅτι μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος, ἐκ τοῦ σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ.—Adv. Hæres.* lib. v. 2, § 3.

[2] 'Ideo Paulus apostolus dixit: "unus Deus Pater, qui super omnes et per omnia et in omnibus nobis."'—Lib. ii. 2, p. 716, ed. Migne.

[3] *διὸ καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους γράφει, ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἐν φόβῳ Θεοῦ, κ.τ.λ.—Stromata,* iv. § 65, p. 592, ed. Potter.

of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness,"' etc.[1]

The Valentinians, as we learn from Irenæus, adduced in their favour such passages as i. 10 ; iii. 21 ; v. 32.[2] Ptolemy quoted Ephes. ii. 15 ; and Theodotus appealed to iv. 9, 10, 24, 30.[3] Basilides used the epistle as Scripture, for so we learn from Hippolytus.[4]

Succeeding writers receive the epistle as an authentic Pauline production. Thus external evidence is unanimous. The greatest value is attached to the testimonies of Polycarp and Irenæus, because the former was a disciple of the apostle John who lived at Ephesus ; and Irenæus was Polycarp's disciple. But Polycarp's epistle is not authentic, so that Irenæus's evidence has no relation to an apostolic voucher. Still the unanimous tradition of the Church is worth something, though it cannot be traced farther back than A.D. 170. Between Paul's imprisonment and A.D. 170, above a century elapsed ; which leaves room for historical criticism to challenge the authenticity.

After a perusal of the epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, the first idea which suggests itself is their connection with one another. It seems difficult to separate them by a wide interval of time or by modes of thought far apart. Though their differences indicate diversity of authorship, they have some general characteristics which relegate them to the same region, and to a state of thought posterior to the Pauline. Both presuppose the operation of influences which did not prevail in Paul's time, so that the development of their christological ideas is higher than his. The doctrinal belief which he originated did not advance so far as

[1] *σαφέστατα δὲ Ἐφεσίοις γράφων ἀπεκάλυψε τὸ ζητούμενον ὧδέ πως λέγων· μέχρι καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες, κ.τ.λ.—Pædagog.* i. § 18, p. 108.

[2] *Contra Hæres.* i. 3, 1; i. 3, 4; i. 8, 4.

[3] *Excerpta Theodoti,* in Fabricius's *Bibliotheca Græca,* vol. v., but excluded from Harles's edition.

[4] *Philosophumena,* lib. vii. 26, p. 374. ed Duncker et Schneidewin.

theirs. Antagonism between Judaising and Pauline dogmatism had been left behind. Gnostic speculations seemed to require the assertion of a universal church under a being superior to the highest æon, in whom all the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily. The epistles have a Pauline basis, on which they build views unknown to the apostle of the Gentiles, and arising out of altered circumstances. Directed against theosophic tendencies which emerged after his decease, their spiritual sweep is wider. Christ is lifted up to an eminence nearer the Father's, for he fills the universal Church with his fulness and supplies it with unceasing life. The author of the epistle to the Hebrews, with his Alexandrian thought, represents Christ as an effulgence of the Father's glory and an express image of his substance ; the epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians transfer the Philonian Logos-doctrine to him, for in them he is *the first* in time and rank of all that is external to God. The Pauline idea of Christ being *the head* of the world is realised by the aid of the Logos-idea which prevents God himself from coming into immediate contact with the finite. The epistle to the Colossians is more easily attributed to the apostle than that to the Ephesians ; but even it exhibits a development of Paulinism over against a current of thought which appears for the first time in the second century.

A variety of particulars in the epistle to the Ephesians raise suspicion against it, and lead to the conclusion that Paul was not the writer.

1. There is a striking resemblance between it and the letter to the Colossians, in ideas and language. It is true there are also differences ; but they are less prominent than coincidences. The table of parallels given by De Wette[1] shows how much agreement exists. And it could not have been accidental. The question is, which is prior ? Mayerhoff thinks that the Ephesian

[1] *Einleit. in das N. T.* pp. 313-18, ed. 6.

epistle preceded; and this view is ably advocated by Holtzmann, who endeavours to prove that the Ephesian writer revised and interpolated the Colossian letter. We cannot accept the hypothesis, because an examination of the two works tends to refute it. The dependence belongs to the epistle to the Ephesians, as De Wette has shown; and more convincingly still, W. Honig.[1] Collating the two letters, we find that i. 3–ii. 10 is partly the Colossian epistle amplified; partly a verbal parallel; ii. 11–22 is tolerably independent, but with occasional resemblances to the prior letter; while iii. 1–9 is a paraphrase of Coloss. i. 24–27. iii. 10–21 and iv. 1–21 are independent. iv. 22–32 is a reproduction of Coloss. iii. 8–13. v. 1–21 is tolerably independent, though not without resemblances to the preceding epistle. v. 22–vi. 9 is from Coloss. iii. 18–iv. 1; vi. 10–20 is original; but vi. 21, 22, agrees with Coloss. iv. 7, 8. vi. 23, 24, is independent. Out of the 155 verses contained in our epistle, 78 contain expressions identical with those in the Colossian letter. The usual explanation of this, founded on the fact of their contemporaneous origin, when the same thoughts and frequently the same expressions were fresh in the writer's mind, is inadequate. The dependence is most apparent in i. 3; ii. 10; in iii. 1–9; and iv. 22–24. Inferiority and partial unsuitability are exemplified in iii. 15, 16, compared with Coloss. ii. 19; in i. 17, 18, compared with Coloss. i. 9; in ii. 5 compared with Coloss. ii. 13; in ii. 15 compared with Coloss. ii. 14; in iv. 4 compared with Coloss. iii. 15; in v. 15 compared with Coloss. iv. 5; and in v. 22 compared with Coloss. iii. 18.

The course of thought in the epistle to the Colossians is simpler and more logical than that in the Ephesian one. The syntax is also more correct, and the style clearer though more concise. Redundancy of words

[1] In Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift* for 1872, p. 63, etc.

characterises the letter to the Ephesians. Where parallels occur, the variations are generally for the worse; showing that the letter to the Colossians is the original. These assertions are founded upon a minute comparison of passages, which we now proceed to exemplify.

In i. 2, 'and the Lord Jesus Christ' is added; the rest of the verse being taken from Coloss. i. 2.

In Coloss. i. 9, 'we *also*,' referring to Epaphras as well as the writer, is appropriate; but the *also* is retained in the corresponding passage, Ephes. i. 15; though Epaphras is not mentioned there.

In Ephes. ii. 1, the commencing *and* is inappropriate. It is taken from Coloss. i. 21, '*and* you,' where it is locally suitable.

In Ephes. ii. 3, the phrase translated 'among whom' must refer to 'the children of disobedience' in the preceding context; though its proper allusion would be to 'the trespasses and sins' of the first verse. The writer copying Coloss. iii. 6–7, was compelled to refer the phrase to 'the children of disobedience.' Had he employed the preceding words of Coloss. iii. 5–6, the phrase would have suited, meaning in that case 'in which.' The borrowing makes the expression awkward.

Comparing Ephes. ii. 1, etc. with Coloss. ii. 13, it is easy to see which is the original, because the construction of the former is irregular, the commencing words 'and you' having no predicate till they are repeated with one in the fifth verse. The Colossian passage is regular and simple in construction; its derivative one is not. It is also worthy of remark, that though the Ephesian writer begins like his prototype with the second person, 'and *you* hath he quickened,' he passes into the first, 'hath quickened *us*.' This change of person was already prepared in the third and fifth verses of the chapter (ii.).

A comparison of the parallels Ephes. ii. 11–18, Coloss. i. 20–22, ii. 14, is instructive in regard to the originality of the latter. They allude to the separation of two parties and the removal of the barrier between them, which effects their union. But the separation spoken of is different. In the Colossian epistle, the disunited are God and man; in the Ephesian, they are Jews and Gentiles. The phraseology of the latter betrays its derivative nature, being less appropriate to the main point in some particulars than that of the former, and exhibiting a trace of the originals whence it was borrowed. In both cases the law is the separating medium which is taken away; but the Ephesian writer calls it 'the enmity' which suggests God as the one to whom it is shown, not *enmity between Jews and Gentiles*; while the word *reconcile* and the very phrase *unto God* (Ephes. ii. 16) are more in harmony with the uniting of God and man, which is the theme in the Colossian passage, than with the incorporation of Jews and Gentiles into one body. The phraseology in the Ephesian passage, though descriptive of a different thing, retains some traces of the sources whence it seems to have been derived.

In Ephes. iii. 7 we read, 'According to the gift of the grace of God given unto me by the effectual working of his power,' the parallel to which is in Coloss. i. 25, 'according to the dispensation of God which is given to me for you.' Here it is easy to see the inferiority of the former phraselogy, for *the dispensation of God* is much more appropriate to the connection than 'the effectual working of his power.' The word ἐνέργεια was borrowed from Coloss. i. 29.

The parallels in Ephes. v. 19 and Coloss. iii. 16 show that the former is taken from the latter with a different application, which is less suitably expressed in the words of the original; for the latter relates to public worship, the former to the intercourse of daily life.

In vi. 21 the words 'you *also*' seem to refer to the Colossians, who had received an epistle before.

An example of irregular construction and digression, in which we can trace the writer's reference to the Colossian letter, appears in the third chapter, whose abrupt commencement speaks of Paul as a prisoner, and after digressing returns to the same idea at the thirteenth verse. The author has respect to Coloss. i. 24, and reverts, after the digression, to his original in Coloss. i. 24-29. The latter epistle follows the idea consistently and uniformly; the former, after taking up the thread, leaves it for a while and resumes it.

2. Unapostolic ideas and phrases occur: such as, 'his holy apostles *and prophets*' (iii. 5); 'he gave some apostles *and some prophets*,' etc. (iv. 11); 'built on the foundation of the apostles *and prophets*' (ii. 20). In these passages *Christian* prophets are meant as distinguished from apostles. But we know from the first epistle to the Corinthians, that the apostle looked upon prophecy as a gift, not as a characteristic of the true Church. Hence the passages betray a post-apostolic age. The epithet *holy*, applied to the apostles in iii. 5, shows a time when they were looked upon with greater reverence than they received during their life; and excludes Paul himself, who is made to say in iii. 8, 'unto me, who am *less than the least* of all *saints*.' The two expressions disagree, neither of them suiting Paul.[1] In 1 Cor. xv. 9, the apostle calls himself 'the least of the apostles,' phraseology imitated and exaggerated in Ephes. iii. 8. The general way in which the apostles are spoken of consists with the fact that the writer did not belong to the class. He refers to them as distinct from himself. The manner too of setting forth Paul's apostolic consciousness is artificial, as the first four verses of the third chapter demonstrate. The introduc-

[1] A specimen of special pleading in regard to this passage may be seen in Canon Farrar's note, *Life and Work of St. Paul*, vol. ii. p. 498.

tion of the alleged writer at the first verse (ch. iii.) is neither natural nor easy; and the revelation of the long hid mystery to him, with his knowledge in it, is emphasised with constraint. Insistence upon the knowledge of a mystery so momentous suits an author who knew the wide-spread fruit of the gospel among Gentiles, and witnessed its mighty effects long after Paul himself had departed; but it is scarcely consonant with the perpetual struggle carried on by the apostle against a Judaising Christianity upheld by Peter, James, and John. 'Unto me who am less than the least of all saints is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God,' etc.

'Let him that stole steal no more: but rather let him labour, working with his hands the thing which is good,' etc. (iv. 28). This admonition to a church where the apostle had laboured three years is unsuitable, especially in the mild form it assumes. The thief is differently spoken of in 1 Cor. v. 11; vi. 9, and severely censured. The same remark applies to the prohibition, 'Be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess' (v. 18). The Christians of Asia Minor had no tendency to drunken excesses, but rather to ascetic abstinence from wine; and the advice given to Timothy might perhaps have been more suitable: 'drink a little wine.' In any case, the exhortation is a singular one in the mouth of Paul writing to persons whom he builds up in the glorious doctrines of a catholic church, pure and unspotted.

The writer has peculiar ideas about evil spirits, whom he supposes to live in the air, to be under a head or prince, and to be very numerous. His language intimates that there are different orders or ranks among them; and that Christians have to resist their evil in-

fluence with persevering opposition, because it is most injurious to spirituality. Such demonological doctrine is un-Pauline. Whether it be of Jewish or Gentile origin is uncertain. How readily it could be linked on to Paul's ideas is apparent from the fact of the apostle's repeated allusions to Satan's temptations and the necessity of resisting them (ii. 2 ; vi. 12, 13). Instead of 'neither give place to the devil,' the Pauline expression is 'give place to wrath' (Rom. xii. 19). It is remarkable that there is a similar phrase to that in iv. 27, in the Clementine homilies (xix. 2), where it is adduced as a saying of Christ's, being probably taken from the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

A phrase applied to all men, and peculiar to the writer, is, 'by nature the children of wrath' (ii. 3), which is commonly taken for a proof-passage of 'original sin.' The apostle Paul nowhere expresses the idea that the natural state of mankind—that which belongs to them originally—is one in which they are subject to the wrath of God. *Nature* does not mean *birth* in the passage.

The co-ordination of faith and love is un-Pauline (vi. 23). Instead of saying 'faith which worketh by love' (Gal. v. 6), the writer has, 'love with faith.' The two are also placed together in the first epistle to Timothy. The closing benediction in which both terms stand, does not savour of Paul, because it is not addressed to the readers directly, and has the difficult expression rendered 'in sincerity,'[1] in the English version. Exegetical difficulties do not belong to authentic Pauline benedictions.

The view given of marriage in v. 22–33 is somewhat peculiar, especially the language of verses 23, 31, 32. Without entering upon the interpretation of the passage, it is enough to observe that the apostle presents another view of the marriage relation in 1 Cor.

[1] ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ.

vii. 2 etc. The Church's relation to Christ under the figure of marriage is an idea which was common among the Jewish Christians; and Paul employs it once against his opponents, borrowing apparently their language in order to refute them more effectually; but why should it be called 'a great mystery?' Was it in allusion to the practical consequences which the Jewish Christians of the second century, particularly the Montanists, drew from the conception? We know that they looked upon *monogamy* alone as permissible.[1]

The explanation which is given of Psalm lxviii. 18, in iv. 8, could scarcely have proceeded from the apostle Paul. Were it an allegorical or typical adaptation of the Psalm to Christ, it might perhaps be justified. The writer understands the passage he quotes to refer to Christ, who, after his completed work on earth, ascended to heaven and gave gifts to men. The original is turned aside in order to bring out that sense; for it describes Jehovah as a victorious monarch returning from battle and ascending to Zion, receiving gifts along his triumphal march from the men who do him homage. How could an apostle identify Christ with Jehovah, and change the *receiving* into the *giving* of gifts? The shifts of interpretation resorted to, for the purpose of justifying the Pauline nature of the quotation, are well exemplified by Harless.[2] In like manner it is unusual with Paul to speak of 'the God of our Lord Jesus Christ' (i. 17). His phraseology is, 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.' God is also called the 'Father of glory' (i. 17), 'who created all things' (iii. 9), 'from whom every family is named' (iii. 15); which expressions have no analogy elsewhere.

3. The writing and style are inferior to Paul's. There is a fulness of expression which partakes of the verbose and redundant. The words are manifold with-

[1] See Schwegler's *Das apostolische Zeitalter*, vol. ii. p. 383.

[2] *Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Epheser*, p. 350, *et seq.* 1st ed.

out conveying proportionate ideas. It is not necessary to read far to perceive verbosity. 'In whom we have boldness and access *with confidence*, by the faith *of him*;' 'that in the ages to come he might show the exceeding riches of his grace, *in his kindness* towards us, by Jesus Christ.' 'Ye may be able to comprehend with all saints what is *the breadth and length* and depth and height; *and to know* the love of God, which passeth knowledge;' 'if so be that ye *have heard him* and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus,' etc. etc. 'To the praise of the glory of his *grace*, wherein he *hath made us accepted* in the beloved; in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of *his grace*.' The idea of grace is expressed three times in these two verses. If we had not the Colossian epistle, the language would appear better; but the briefer style of the prior letter, with its natural and forcible development of ideas, throws the thoughts and diction of its successor into the shade. Besides, the syntax is irregular and intricate; the rhetoric weakly expanded. We admit that the apostle Paul did not write logically; that his constructions are often anomalous, his figures mixed, his sentences awkward or abrupt and his language full of passion: but with all these drawbacks, degeneracy of style and syntax is obvious in the Ephesian epistle.

These observations are supported by abundant evidence. Thus we read in iv. 16: 'From whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love,' which is a wordy expansion of Coloss. ii. 19. A similar remark applies to vi. 18–20: 'Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance, and supplication for all saints; and for me, that utterance may be given

unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel, for which I am an ambassador in bonds : that therein I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak,' which is borrowed from Coloss. iv. 2–4. The comparison of the Christian to a soldier, and the different parts of his armour to various graces or gifts (vi. 11–17), are spun out in rhetorical fashion. The passage is developed out of 2 Cor. x. 3, 4, where the theme is briefly touched without a tedious descent into particulars, which only weakens the general impression.

In iii. 8, 9, we read : 'Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God ; who created all things by Jesus Christ.' Here there is a needless repetition of what had been said a few verses before, about the grace of God given to the writer to preach among the Gentiles a mystery which had been hid for ages but was now manifested.

As to syntax and sentences, i. 3–14 may be called one long period, whose parts are loosely joined. So is iii. 14–19. At ii. 1 there is an interruption, and the construction is resumed at the fourth verse. At iii. 2 there is a digression, the thread of discourse not being resumed till the fourteenth verse. In i. 15–ii. 7, which may be termed a continuous sentence, the successive statements are generally appended to one another by the copulative conjunction *and*, which gives a lame effect to the whole. The stream of thought flows on, weakened by superfluous expressions and loose junctions. The obscurity in vi. 9, 'do *the same things* unto them,' arises from paraphrasing the word *equality* in Coloss. iv. 1. The union of the two verbs in v. 5[1] is

[1] ἴστε γινώσκοντες.

without example in other parts of the New Testament, as is the optative mood after the conjunction *that* (ἵνα) in i. 17. But these grammatical peculiarities are perhaps compatible with Paul's authorship.

Neither the encyclical nature of the epistle nor the supposition of free dictation explains the phenomena referred to. Let the mode of writing be compared with that of the epistle to the Romans—the system of inserting periods and interrupting the thread of discourse, with the sharp, marked method of the Roman letter—and the difference becomes palpable.

4. If the epistle was addressed by Paul to the Ephesian church, why does it deal in generalities, so that the reader can neither discover the occasion that called it forth, nor the peculiar circumstances of the persons? It is not polemic but didactic. Apologists find it easy to say that he had no particular doctrine to prove or defend, no error to combat; that he only meant to set forth the glorious constitution and privileges of the universal Church under its head Jesus Christ. This, however, is not his practice. Other letters show a specific object and personal references. Why should the present be unlike them? Does not the absence of definite traits betray another author? The *general* character of the thoughts expressed is an argument against Pauline authorship, unless the apostle had never been among the Ephesians. The only personal notice is the mention of Tychicus in vi. 21, taken almost verbally from Coloss. iv. 7, 8.

5. Though the occurrence of words that appear in no other Pauline epistle cannot prove diversity of authorship, for every letter has peculiar expressions of its own, some may be of such a nature as to excite suspicion and confirm that diversity. Here may be adduced τὰ ἐπουράνια *heaven* (i. 3, 20; ii. 6; iii. 10; vi. 12); τὰ πνευματικὰ *spirits* (vi. 12); κοσμοκράτορες *subordinate spirits* (vi. 12); σωτήριον (vi. 16); πολυ-

ποίκιλος σοφία (iii. 10) *manifold wisdom. To be filled unto* (iii. 19). *The kingdom of Christ and of God* (v. 5), is not found in Paul's epistles; neither does περιποίησις mean *possession* or *purchased possession* (i. 14), in his writings. οἰκονομία (i. 10; iii. 9) is *the divine administration*, not as in 1 Cor. ix. 17; Coloss. i. 25, and even in iii. 2, *the dispensation of the apostolic office*; ἀφθαρσία *incorruptness* or *sincerity* (vi. 24), only in Titus ii. 7; whereas Paul uses it in the sense of *immortality* (Rom ii. 7); αἰὼν (ii. 2), *the course* or *moving principle, the spirit*, different from its use in other places; *the prince of the power of the air* (ii. 2) seems to be identical with Paul's *prince* or *God of this world*. The appellation *devil* occurs twice (iv. 27; vi. 11), which is not found in Paul's authentic epistles, where *Satan* is used.

These considerations cast strong doubts on the apostolic authorship of the epistle. The sentiments indeed are generally Pauline as well as the diction; but both betray marks of another writer. Amid striking similarities, peculiar phenomena point to an unknown person later than the apostle, repeating from his pages what he could not have otherwise written, and occasionally uttering un-Pauline sentiments.

In questions of this nature much depends on critical perception and taste. The standard of judgment must vary with the person who judges. Subjective feelings may indeed be too active and the perceptive power too subtle. Under such circumstances, 'subjective cavils' may be applicable to the fancies of the critic. But it is impossible to exclude subjectivity. The feelings must and ought to perform a part. A sense of taste, aided by known phenomena, ideas of the proper and suitable under certain conditions, cannot but affect conclusions. A rough critic who is mainly objective, or at home only in generals, cannot decide questions of thought and language involving fine comparisons. What then?

Was the writer a *successful forger*? So they love to speak, who cannot or will not transport themselves into early Christian times. Forgery is a term of modern origin, wholly inapplicable to the early pseudonymous Christian writings. The author of the epistle had no wish to deceive, but wrote in the name of Paul to procure acceptance for his work. The fact that he was a later Pauline, living at a time when the old Paulinism had given place to an uncontroversial and attenuated type, and that he sometimes misapprehended the writer whom he followed, puts him out of the class of deceitful forgers.

It is not surprising that an uncritical age failed to discern different authorship. Indeed the early Christians, even had they perceived the diversity, would not have attached importance to it, or rejected the epistle on that account. As their spiritual instincts were better than their critical judgment, they rightly gave the letter a place in the canon. Its universal acceptance as Paul's for so long a time is no valid argument against its not being his—certainly no ground for branding it as a *forgery*. The production having a general Pauline basis was received as the apostle's, notwithstanding its marks of later authorship. If it be upheld as an authentic work of Paul's by the majority of modern scholars, is it surprising that it should have been received as his at first? Christians were then indisposed to examine its claims. Enough that it met their spiritual wants and fostered the divine life within them. The writer was a Jew by birth, as appears from i. 12, ii. 3, 10, 11, where he distinguishes himself from the Gentiles addressed. He seems familiar with Pauline and post-Pauline literature, attaching himself most to the Colossian epistle, whose views he carries forward in their relation to cognate topics. He was not therefore a mere copyist. His prominent idea is catholicity. The realisation aimed at, is the community of predestinated

believers as the harmonising unit of contrarieties. His great object is to establish the doctrine of catholicism on a Pauline basis ; and to promote that incipient growth which had already appeared till it should become a universal community realising the eternal counsel of God in fusing together powers before at variance and completing the fulness of Christ *objectively*.

In accordance with this practical interest, the christology of the epistle, though the same as that of the Colossian letter, is presented in a different light. The central pre-eminence of Christ in the universe—the perfection of divine fulness and power in him—is not described as realising *in itself* the perfect conciliation of all antinomies and universal salvation, but in relation to the objective union of all Christians. The christology is more ethical than dogmatic ; or rather, it is presented in an ethical aspect. On its practical side, there is an advance upon the Colossian epistle ; on the doctrinal, none. The latter indeed seems even to be retrograde in chapter i. 17–22, where the exaltation of Christ is spoken of just as it is in Paul's epistles, and the co-ordination of Christ with God lapses into subordination. But the passage is immediately followed by a statement of Christ's inherent pre-eminence as high as that of the Colossian epistle ; for it is he *who fills all in all*, who is the central being in the universe.

The chief variation of our epistle from that to the Colossians lies in the sense attached to the *pleroma*. Instead of using it of the fulness of the Godhead dwelling in Christ, the writer understands it of the thing filled or the spiritual body. The Colossian author regards Christ as the absolute principle in himself ; He is the fulness of divine life and power within his own person ; the Ephesian author looks upon the Church as contributing to that fulness. According to the latter, Christ receives his completion by and with his body, so that the process of filling up is progressive, being realised

gradually. Though consummated *ideally*, it is *objectively* growing. When the Church has fully developed all its powers and unfolded its highest life, the full strength and beauty of the divine organism consisting of the head and the members will be realised; the central principle of the universe will be completed on its earthly side; and Christ will then fill all creation *in actuality*. The entire pleroma, head and body, is not consummated till the latter perfects itself. Such is the way in which our writer conceives of the pleroma, which is the Church itself, not the fulness of the Godhead dwelling in Christ. As Pfleiderer well observes, it is an ethical, not a dogmatic idea, arising from the practical interest of the Ephesian author. The doctrine of a catholic church shaped his view of the pleroma—a view which detracts from the essential fulness of Christ *apparently* but not *really*; since the one pleroma embraced head and body in the counsels of eternity.

These observations may serve to correct the statements of Harless in showing that the epistle is *pervaded* by a course of thought of its own and contains important additions to the parallels of the Colossian letter. The passages respecting the symbolical nature of marriage and the Christian armour are not important. Nor is it altogether correct to say with him that the one writer dwelt mainly on the glory of Christ's person; the other on the great facts of redemption. The difference is of another kind, as we have just indicated. Both stand on a Pauline basis; the one advancing beyond the other; but the differences must not be exaggerated or incorrectly apprehended, as they are by Harless and those who agree with him. The Ephesian letter exhibits both dependence and independence—dependence on the Colossian one partly in language and partly in ideas; independence in the adaptation of Pauline and post-Pauline conceptions to the formation of a catholic church.

Those who suppose that the apostle wrote both epistles during the same captivity may discuss their relative claims to priority. Lardner has adduced arguments for the priority of the epistle to the Ephesians; while Credner and Reuss give additional ones on the same side.

TIME, PLACE, AND OCCASION OF WRITING.

Those who think that Paul wrote the epistle usually put it with the letters addressed to the Colossians, Philemon, and Philippians, as nearly contemporaneous; and fix upon Cæsarea or Rome as the author's locality. The various arguments adduced by the advocates of the respective places do not concern us. Had the letter proceeded from the apostle, we should have maintained that it was written at Rome, because he had an opportunity of preaching the gospel there, which he cannot be supposed to have enjoyed in Cæsarea (Ephes. vi. 19, 20). But as that is disproved, we must fix a later date. Apart from the dependence of our epistle on that to the Colossians, it is easy to see that it originated in the Gnostic period. *Pleroma* variously applied, especially to the universal Church, *epignosis* (full knowledge), *synesis* (understanding), *sophia* and *phronesis* (wisdom and prudence), are employed with reference to those sects, in the interest of Paulinism. The Gnostics are pointed at in the expression *God who created all things* (iii. 9), contrasted with the demiurge. The catholic Church is opposed to the false *Gnosis*, a church in which Jews and Gentiles have equal privileges, and form one body, united with and part of Christ's all-comprehending fulness. The *æon* of this world, for 'the god of this world' (ii. 2), is also Gnostic; and the language 'above all principality and power and might and dominion, and every name that is named;' 'the principalities and powers in heavenly

places;' 'principalities, powers, the rulers of the darkness of this world, spiritual wickedness in high places,' indicates the same period. As the metaphysical christology of the Colossian epistle appears here, the same view is given of the spirit world with its several ranks of angels, and Christ exalted above all. It is *he* that mirrors forth the unseen God, not a series of æons. The Gnostic atmosphere in which the epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians move is similar; but the latter is less polemic than the former, because the object was practical. Presupposing the christological doctrine of the Colossian epistle, the Ephesian writer applies it to the realisation of a universal Church which should unite in itself the best elements of Gnostic doctrine, harmonising opposites, reconciling contradictions, fulfilling the eternal counsels of God, making the universe reflect the divine power and peace in fullest measure. The mention of 'all wisdom and prudence,' of 'making known' and 'revealing,' of 'hearing and learning,' of 'full knowledge' and 'mystery,' familiar expressions in the epistle, is meant to show that Christianity is the essence and object of true *Gnosis*, because it is the absolute religion, the bond of union between both worlds, the reconciler of all antinomies. New circumstances had arisen with the progress of time. The work of the apostle Paul had shown its far-reaching effects much more than it had done in his lifetime. The Gentile Christians belonging to Asia Minor were reaching after higher knowledge, and priding themselves on their exalted privileges. Judaistic Christianity was in the background. Philosophic speculations, oriental theosophy, fanatical notions, intruded themselves into Christian doctrines, giving them a peculiar aspect and even subverting them. The leaven of Gnosticism had become a prominent factor in the thought of Gentile Christians. Montanism too was showing itself. These altered relations

needed other treatment than that which the churches of Rome, Corinth, Galatia, Thessalonica, or even of Alexandria had received in the first century. The church which was being filled up with Gentiles, and was tending toward catholicity, needed instruction as to its new position in the divine economy. It had to be admonished and exhorted respecting its true life. The writer's object was to hold up to the view of the Ephesians an universal Church of which they were a part—a Church constituting the fulness of Christ and one with him.

The post-Pauline production before us was evidently the work of a thoughtful Christian, far-seeing, comprehensive in the range of his ideas, possessed of a high inspiration. Compared with the epistle to the Colossians, it is certainly inferior; viewed by itself it claims a leading place among the canonical epistles. The school of Paul produced none equal to himself; but it gave rise to men of large sympathies—some choice spirits on whom the mantle of the departed may be said to have fallen. Had there been more of them, the seed sown by Paul would have yielded a richer harvest; and congregations would have better resisted adverse influences. But they were few, they wrote little, and were overpowered by the advancing corruption of the times. The post-Pauline doctrine was not developed with adequate perception and power. The catholic Church described by the Ephesian writer did not appear; another was built up instead, into which the worldly element entered and marred its beauty.

As Marcion had the epistle in his canon it must have been written before A.D. 140; but the date cannot be exactly determined. It has been inferred, however, from a comparison with the first epistle of Peter, conducted by Seufert in an exhaustive essay leading up to identity of authorship.[1] But the argument, though

[1] See Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift* for 1881.

carried out ingeniously and with much appearance of validity, is liable to doubt. If the Colossian epistle with its express allusion to Gnostic errors of a certain complexion preceded that to the Ephesians, the latter probably belongs to a time after Trajan. The idea of a united catholic Church, including believers in heaven and earth, with Christ as the all-embracing head, is not prominent in the first epistle of Peter. The tenor of the Ephesian letter presupposes a more complete amalgamation of Petrinism and Paulinism than the first of Peter; the process of uniting being more apparent in the latter. It is admitted that both drew from the letter to the Romans, and that they have resemblances. But *identity* of authorship does not necessarily follow; and the hypothesis of dependence, though rejected by Seufert, is possible. The writer of the epistle to the Ephesians may have used the first of Peter, though his leading ideas transcend any that are enunciated in the previous letter. We are unable to accept the opinion of one author for both, believing them to be separated by an interval of time, and by other circumstances. The date may be between 130 and 140. It originated in Asia Minor, and preceded the fourth gospel. Genuine Paulinism was not strong in that region at the time; the influence of the apostle John had pushed it into the background, and Gnosticism had affected it. Post-Paulinism was the prevailing type of doctrine among the Gentile churches. The present epistle with its predecessor advanced it in other forms and aspects. It brought post-Paulinism near to the Johannine theology. Both the epistle and the fourth gospel ignore the doctrine of justification. Nor does a vicarious satisfaction for sin appear in them. Great importance is attached to baptism with its cleansing and sanctifying efficacy. 'Christ gave himself for the Church that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word,' a statement bearing re-

lationship to the water and the blood in John xix. 34, which symbolise the two sacraments.

The conception of the Spirit is perhaps that which resembles most nearly the Paraclete in John. In the epistle, the spirit is a ruling principle that reveals the knowledge of the mystery of Christ. It is the medium of the indwelling of God and Christ in us, a gift proceeding from the exalted Christ and imparted to his Church. It is true that by hypostatising the spirit, John gives it a more concrete existence; yet even in the epistle it is an active power, operating with considerable independence.[1]

CONTENTS.

The epistle contains a doctrinal and a practical part; the former embracing the first three chapters; the latter, the last three.

The usual salutation (i. 1, 2) is followed by a general thanksgiving to God for His blessings of redemption, consisting of three subdivisions marked by a like ending, 'to the praise of the glory of His grace' (6, 12, 14). In the first, the author mentions the eternal election of a spotless Church which is introduced to the privileges of children; in the second, the realisation of that election by redemption through the blood of Christ on the one hand, and by the announcement of the divine decree of salvation on the other. The fulness of all wisdom lies in the perception of that mystery, whose central point is the person of Christ. Jewish-Christians (including the apostle) obtain this salvation agreeably to the divine predestination realised in the Messiah; Gentile Christians, on the ground of their believing reception of a new message to them through which they are sealed by the Spirit till the

[1] See Köstlin's *Der Lehrbegriff des Evangeliums und der Briefe Johannis*, p. 372, etc.

day of full redemption (i. 3, 14). After this general thanksgiving to God, in which the writer departs from Paul's manner at the commencement of his epistles, he gives special thanks for the faith and love shown by his readers, stating that his unceasing prayer on their behalf was that their knowledge and wisdom might be increased, whence they might learn the greatness of the power exerted in quickening them together with Christ, though formerly dead in trespasses and sins, and be enabled after their new creation to bring forth fruit to the praise of that grace which abounds in the work of salvation (i. 15–ii. 10).

He reminds his Gentile readers of the blessings which they already experienced. Though they had not previously possessed, like the Jews, a solid hope of salvation, they had attained to a full participation in all the privileges of the theocracy, since the death of Christ had removed the separating barrier of the law, and formed the two portions of the ante-Christian world, which were mutually hostile, into one new community, which is based on the foundation of the apostolic announcement of Christ, and becomes an habitation of God through the Spirit (ii. 11–22). All this interrupts the intercession on behalf of his readers begun in i. 17 (ii. 11–22).

Returning to the former prayer for those addressed (iii. 1), he immediately breaks off to tell them how it is that he is concerned for the Gentile Christians of Ephesus, many of whom were personally unknown to him. They had heard, if not they would see from the present letter, that the mystery now made known respecting the right of the Gentiles to be partakers of salvation had been specially revealed to him; that he had received a commission to preach the gospel, and to announce this mystery to them, that the entire fulness of the divine wisdom might be known in the realisation of the everlasting purpose of God. He has but one

wish for them, that they should not be dispirited on account of sufferings endured for their sake ; and in a solemn prayer, he asks that they may be replenished with faith, love, and knowledge, to the full measure of their capacity (iii. 1–21). The first part of the epistle closes with the 3rd chapter.

The practical part opens with an exhortation to Christian and ecclesiastical unity, with reference to its subjective as well as objective conditions. God has distributed manifold gifts to bring the Church to completeness as the body of Christ (iv. 1–16).

He exhorts the readers not to walk after the manner of the heathen, but to be entirely renewed, annexing a series of moral precepts appropriate to Christians in all circumstances (iv. 17–v. 20).

From general relations the author passes to special ones, treating first of the duties belonging to husbands and wives, representing the conjugal connection as similar to that subsisting between Christ and his Church ; secondly, of the reciprocal duties of parents and children ; and thirdly, of the duties of masters and slaves (v. 21–vi. 9).

The language again becomes general. Believers are described as soldiers fighting for truth and righteousness, whose spiritual armour is minutely stated. In conclusion, he requests an interest in the prayers of the Ephesians, refers them to Tychicus the bearer of the epistle for information about his personal circumstances, and closes with a benediction (vi. 9–24).

Such is a brief analysis of the epistle.

The difficulties inherent in the treatise are apparent to the critical reader. They are greater than those in the Colossian one, notwithstanding the smoother language. As to the depths beneath depths which some discover, the ideas beneath ideas forming a conglomeration of thought and labouring for utterance, the wonderful and complicated allusions, the logical setting of

every word, the part contributed by each phrase to the carrying out of an organic whole, the exact succession and arrangement not only of phrases but of single words —these are largely the offspring of fancy. Minute study is as necessary here as in the case of the epistles to the Romans and Colossians; but such study will never find the logical place of every word, or the precise contribution which each phrase in its peculiar position makes to the organic whole. The letter is not *a systematic* treatise; nor does it bear evidence of artificial polish, either in structure or composition.[1] Its difficulties arise in part from the misty notions the writer had about the influence of Christ's redemptive work upon the universe, from his demonology and especially from longings after a catholic church united and perfect, pervaded by one doctrine and spirit, animated by faith and love in all its members, a church bringing heaven and earth together in spiritual embrace, the ideal church which attracts the finest minds in all ages and forms a happy dream of the future. The author wrote to instruct, to make Pauline Christianity a comprehensive religion expressing itself in a united and all-embracing Church. If he had not always clear conceptions, we cannot find fault. He had not the ability to body forth original thoughts with freshness. Though he was to some extent an independent thinker, he compiled and paraphrased. Can we wonder that the exegetical difficulties of his writing are considerable, especially where he departs from his originals in conveying a less appropriate sense, or in paraphrasing repeats himself? He advances beyond the Colossian writer in respect to a universal Church, and may possibly have tried to emend the epistle of his predecessor; but his writing lacks the terseness and force which characterise its precursor.

[1] Canon Farrar calls it, in his grandiloquent style, 'a grand eucharistic hymn.' It is simply a doctrinal and practical treatise in the form of a letter.

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.

AUTHENTICITY.

POLYCARP knew and used the epistle, since he writes to the Philippians, 'Every one who confesses not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is an antichrist.' [1] The resemblance of this language to 1 John iv. 2, 3, is apparent, though Scholten argues that it does not show Polycarp's acquaintance with the epistle.[2]

Eusebius states that Papias employed the epistle: 'He (Papias) has used testimonies out of John's first epistle.' [3]

The same historian says that Irenæus often cited passages from it.[4] In accordance with this testimony we find allusions to it in his extant work against heresies, especially in iii. 16, where he expressly attributes it to the apostle John. Kirchhofer says that he cites it only three times, all in the same chapter.[5]

Clement of Alexandria has referred to the epistle repeatedly. Thus in his 'Miscellanies:' 'John also, in his larger epistle, seems to show the difference of sins. "If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death,"' etc.[6]

[1] *πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι, ἀντίχριστός ἐστιν.*—Cap. vii.

[2] *Die ältesten Zeugnisse betreffend die Schriften des N. T.*, p. 45.

[3] *κέχρηται δ' ὁ αὐτὸς* (ὁ Παπίας) *μαρτυρίαις ἀπὸ τῆς προτέρας Ἰωάννου ἐπιστολῆς.*—*H. E.* iii. 39.

[4] *H. E.* v. 8.

[5] *Adv. Hæres.* pp. 241, 242, ed. Grabe.

[6] *φαίνεται δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ μείζονι ἐπιστολῇ τὰς διαφορὰς τῶν ἁμαρ-*

Tertullian received it as John's: 'Lastly, let us consider whom the apostles saw: "That which we have seen," says John, "which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes,"' etc.[1]

Cyprian writes: 'And the apostle John remembering the commandment afterwards put in his epistle, "In this," says he, "we understand that we have known him, if we keep his commandments."'[2]

Origen, speaking of the apostle John, says: 'He has also left an epistle of a very few lines. Perhaps also a second and third; for all do not allow these to be genuine. However, both together do not make a hundred lines.'[3]

Dionysius of Alexandria held the authenticity of the epistle and fourth gospel, and on that ground questioned the apostolic authorship of the Apocalypse.[4]

The epistle is found in the old Syriac version, which does not contain the second and third; and is also in the Muratorian canon.

Eusebius puts it among the writings universally received by the churches.[5]

Succeeding testimonies need not be given, since they are all to the same effect. Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Jerome, and others agree. Thus the letter is well attested by the voice of antiquity. As far as external evidence reaches, the authenticity seems to be secure.

τιῶν ἐκδιδάσκων ἐν τούτοις· Ἐάν τις ἴδῃ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτάνοντα, κ.τ.λ. —Lib. ii. p. 464, ed. Potter.

[1] 'Denique inspiciamus, quem apostoli viderint. Quod vidimus, inquit Joannes, quod audivimus, oculis nostris vidimus,' etc.—*Adv. Praxeam*, c. 15.

[2] 'Et Joannes apostolus mandati memor in epistola sua postmodum posuit: "In hoc, inquit, intelligimus quia cognovimus eum, si præcepta ejus custodiamus,"' etc.—*Ep.* 28 (alii 25).

[3] καταλέλοιπε δὲ καὶ ἐπιστολὴν πάνυ ὀλίγων στίχων· ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην· ἐπεὶ οὐ πάντες φασὶ γνησίους εἶναι ταύτας· πλὴν οὐκ εἰσὶ στίχων ἀμφότεραι ἑκατόν.—Ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25.

[4] See Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 25.

[5] Among the ὁμολογούμενα.—*H. E.* iii. 25.

On the contrary internal evidence is unfavourable to apostolic authorship. Assuming the fourth gospel to be John's, some rely on internal evidence as proving identity of authorship between it and the first epistle; others contend that the apostle wrote neither.

The writer does not give his name. He does not say that he is John the apostle or even John the presbyter. Nor do we think that he intends to intimate in the first five verses his identity with the author of the gospel, but only that he was an apostle and eyewitness. If John was alive at the time, the author wished perhaps to be considered that aged disciple; if he were not, the intention may still have been to personate one so distinguished. The author of the Apocalypse could not have been the letter-writer. The same conclusion follows from the fact that the apostle did not compose the fourth gospel. The only question of importance that remains is, Did the epistle and fourth gospel proceed from the same person? a question which many answer in the affirmative, or look upon, with C. A. Wolf, as already settled.[1]

(*a.*) The epistle moves in the same circle of ideas as the gospel. Its leading views and representations are alike. The same expressions occur, the same images are used, and the same dualism.

To do the truth (1 John i. 6; John iii. 21); *the truth is not in* one (i. 8; ii. 4; John viii. 44); *to be of the truth* (ii. 21; John xviii. 37); *to be of the devil*, or *children of the devil* (iii. 8; John viii. 44); *to be of God* (iii. 10; John vii. 17; viii. 47); *to be of the world* (iv. 5; John viii. 23); *to speak of the earth*, or *of the world* (iv. 5; John iii. 31); *to abide in God, and He in us* (iv. 13; John vi. 56; xv. 4, etc.); *to walk in darkness, in light* (i. 6, 7; ii. 11; John viii. 12; xii. 35); *to know God* or *Christ* (ii. 3, 4, 13, 14); iv. 6–8; v. 20;

[1] See *Ein exegetischer und practischer Commentar zu den drei Briefen St. Johannis*, 1881.

John xvi. 3 ; xvii. 25 ; *to see God* (iv. 20 ; John i. 18 ; vi. 46 ; xiv. 9) ; *to lay down one's life* (iii. 16 ; John x. 11, 17, 18 ; xv. 13) ; *to have sin* (i. 8 ; John ix. 41 ; xv. 22, 24 ; xix. 11) ; *to have life* or *eternal life* (iii. 15 ; v. 12, etc. ; John iii. 15, etc., 36 ; v. 24, 39, 40 ; vi. 40, 47, 54 ; x. 10) ; *knows not whither he goeth* (ii. 11 ; John xii. 35) ; *to pass from death to life* (iii. 14 ; John v. 24) ; *to overcome the world* (v. 4, etc. ; John xvi. 33) ; *to receive testimony* (v. 9 ; John iii. 11, 32 ; v. 34) ; *to take away sin* (iii. 5 ; John i. 29) ; *to be able*, with respect to moral possibility (iii. 9 ; iv. 20 ; John v. 44 ; viii. 43 ; xiv. 17) ; *paraclete* (ii. 1 ; John xiv. 16) ; *murderer* (iii. 15 ; John viii. 44) ; *the only-begotten Son* (iv. 9 ; John i. 14, 18 ; iii. 16, 18) ; *commandment* (ii. 3, 4, 7, 8 ; iii. 22–24 ; iv. 21 ; v. 2, 3 ; John x. 18 ; xii. 49, 50 ; xiii. 34 ; xiv. 15, 21 ; xv. 10, 12).

An affirmation and negation occur beside one another as, *we lie and do not the truth* (1 John i. 6) ; *he confessed and denied not* (John i. 20) ; comp. also 1 John i. 5, 8 ; ii. 4, 10, 27, 28, with John i. 3 ; iii. 20 ; v. 24 ; vii. 18. Statements are made by antitheses placed beside each other : 1 John ii. 9, 10, 11, 23 ; iii. 6–8 ; iv. 2, 3, 6, 7, 8 ; v. 10, 12 ; John iii. 18, 20, etc., 35, etc. ; vii. 18 ; viii. 23 ; x. 10, etc. So too, antitheses contribute to the progress of the discourse, or to its greater exactness : *not—but*, 1 John ii. 2, 7, 21 ; iii. 18 ; iv. 1, 10, 18 ; v. 6, 18 ; John i. 8 ; iii. 17, 28 ; iv. 14 ; v. 22, 30, 34 ; vi. 32, 38. Explanations are subjoined with the introductory *this is* : 1 John i. 5 ; ii. 25 ; iii. 11, 23 ; v. 3, 11, 14 ; or *by this* : iii. 10 ; iv. 2, 9, 17 ; comp. John i. 19 ; iii. 19 ; vi. 29, 39, 40 ; xv. 12 ; xvii. 3.

Life is a predicate of Christ : 1 John i. 1, 2 ; v. 11, 20 ; John i. 4 ; vi. 33, 35, 48 ; xi. 25. *Light* is an attribute of God and Christ : 1 John i. 5, 7 ; ii. 8 ; John i. 4, 5, 7, etc. ; iii. 19. *Testimony* and *to bear witness* are frequent ideas : 1 John v. 6, 9, 10, 11 ;

John v. 36 ; viii. 17, etc. *The love of God in sending Christ* is stated by both : 1 John iv. 9 ; John iii. 16. *Mutual love* as the commandment of Christ, is in 1 John iii. 11, 16, 18, 23 ; John xiii. 34 ; xv. 12, 17.[1]

(*b.*) The verbal coincidences are most striking in—

1 JOHN.		GOSPEL.
i. 4	compared with	xvi. 24.
i. 10	„ „	viii. 37.
ii. 7, 8	„ „	xiii. 34.
ii. 11	„ „	xii. 35.
ii. 27	„ „	ii. 25 ; xvi. 30.
iii. 13	„ „	xv. 18.
iii. 5	„ „	i. 29.
iii. 8	„ „	viii. 34, etc.
iii. 16	„ „	x. 10–15.
iv. 5	„ „	xv. 19 ; xvii. 14, etc.
iv. 9	„ „	iii. 16.
iv. 12	„ „	i. 18.

Do these coincidences of view, idea, and expression prove identity of authorship ? Is it the same writer who shows his mystic theology, his intuitional depth, his tenderness, simplicity, pathos ? Does the attractiveness proceed from one spirit ? The answer is not so easy as some imagine, because there is variation with similarity. It is true that variation in such circumstances is not a necessary mark of different authorship, because no writer can be expected to repeat himself in two works without some differences. But these deviations, though not numerous, are inconsistent with one authorship.

1. The writer of the epistle speaks of Christ's *manifestation* or *coming*, in the manner of the apostolic epistles. *This event* he apprehends as near, for it is *the last time*, because of the many antichrists who have appeared (ii. 18, 28). Of such eschatology the evangelist knows nothing, for instead of a visible coming, he

[1] See a collection of parallel passages in the conclusive work entitled *A brief Examination of prevalent Opinions on the Inspiration of the Scriptures. by a Protestant Layman of the Church of England*, p. 96, *et seq.*

speaks of a spiritual reappearance. Christ's second advent is resolved into the Spirit's mission to the disciples. Jesus comes again to them in the Advocate. And in relation to judgment, he speaks of it as present. Future and present are comprehended in the one idea of eternal life, which is a present possession. He attaches no importance to the future, because it had already become present. But the epistle speaks of a future, material advent, and a day of judgment.

The force of this argument is not effaced by references to John v. 28, and ep. iii. 14, because in the former the personal reappearing of Christ is not implied; and in the latter, the present possession of eternal life does not exclude the future judgment (ii. 28) of the righteous. If the former passage be authentic all the force that can be allowed it is small.

2. There is no trace of antichrist in the gospel, a circumstance in harmony with its genius. Victory over the evil principle is already accomplished by the death of Christ (xvi. 33). The writer of the epistle speaks of many antichrists in his time.

3. The doctrine of a *paraclete* distinct from Christ is wanting in the epistle. Indeed, the Spirit is never called the paraclete in it. Christ himself is so termed (ii. 1). The Spirit is viewed somewhat differently in the two works. We do not suppose that he is *hypostatised* in either; he is only *personified.* But in the epistle he is less closely identified with Christ. He *witnesses* and is *truth*; but he is not the Spirit of Christ emphatically; nor is he his representative so fully as to be identified with him. He is *the anointing* which believers receive from the holy One, which leads them into all knowledge and teaches them concerning all things; but it is not said that he proceeds directly from, or is sent by, Christ. His personification is not so prominent; nor is he brought into so close union with Christ. This indicates a date prior to the gospel's.

4. Christ is not termed the *Logos* or *Word* absolutely, as he is in the gospel. He is *the life, the eternal life* which was with the Father, *the Son of God*; not *the Word*. High as the epithets are, they involve a conception of his person inferior to the gospel's.

5. The epistle has a polemic tendency which is obviously antidocetic. This is most conspicuous in the commencing words (i. 1–3), and in iv. 2. The gospel, so far from being antidocetic, hovers on the borders of docetism. According to it, Jesus had a body not confined to the conditions of a material one, but such as could and did alter its form.

6. There is little doubt that the blood and the water in xix. 34 are symbolical. They may be so also in the epistle, but they are put in a different order. This fact is significant, and has a special bearing upon the idea which the writer of the fourth gospel meant to bring out when he narrates the piercing of Jesus's side with a spear. The epistolary author puts *water* first, because he had another conception of it than that which was in the evangelist's mind. The arrangement of the words, and the different significance attached to them, presuppose two writers. It is unnecessary to explain the passages; we merely call attention to their divergent senses.

7. The representation of the atonement in i. 7; ii. 2; iv. 10, is not the same as that of the gospel, which does not speak of *propitiation*. The cleansing power attributed to the blood of Christ resembles the view given in the epistle to the Hebrews. In the gospel Jesus is said to *take away* sin, and to *give His flesh* for the life of the world, the former expression occurring in the epistle also; but the leading view of his death in the epistle is that it is propitiatory and cleansing, as if he were a priest.

8. The distinction between venial and deadly sins is one unknown to the gospel, and savours of a post-

apostolic time. Nothing like it is found in John; nor can we conceive the writer of the fourth gospel forbidding prayer to be offered by a Christian brother for another who had committed some deadly transgression. The sins unto death are a class, not one particular act; and cannot therefore be identified with the unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost. It is also remarkable, that another part of the epistle seems contradictory to that passage in the 5th chapter which refers to mortal sin. 'The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin.' How can this be, if a class of sins be unpardonable and necessarily lead to death?

9. The attribute of *light* ascribed to God, who is also said to be *in the light*, is more materialistic than the conceptions of the gospel respecting the Supreme. A kindred idea appears in calling Christ *the true light*; but God is not described so.

10. Although the epistle, considered by itself, belongs to an ideal as well as a practical region, it has neither the tenderness nor depth of the gospel. Its utterances are feebler, less connected, more repetitious. Its ideas have not the originality of those in the fourth gospel. Less philosophical and profound, they are expressed in a senile manner. Yet they are tinctured with a high pantheism. Antignostic as they are, they are antagonistic to the world and supersensuous in tone. The epistle is far below the gospel in persuasive energy. If the same author wrote both, he was very unequal. But this is not probable. The speculative soul which conceived the gospel, would scarcely dissolve its power in the vague generalities of the epistle. The difference between them is too marked to be attributed to the same person. While the ideas of the epistle have an excellence that sometimes approaches that of the gospel, they betray inferiority. We admit that the gospel contains repetitions, but they are not so weak; nor is it easy to conceive of its author writing: 'He

that hateth his brother is in darkness, and walketh in darkness, and knoweth not whither he goeth, because that darkness hath blinded his eyes;' 'By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep His commandments; for this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments;' 'He that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as He is righteous;' 'But the anointing which ye have received of Him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in Him;' 'I write unto you, little children, because your sins are forgiven you for his name's sake. I write unto you, fathers, because ye have known Him that is from the beginning. I write unto you, young men, because ye have overcome the wicked one. I write unto you, little children, because ye have known the Father. I have written unto you, fathers, because ye have known Him that is from the beginning,' etc. etc. 'All that is *in the world*..... is not of the Father but is *of the world*.'

These observations show diversity of authorship without disproving the opinion that John the apostle wrote the epistle. But it is improbable that the author of the Apocalypse composed it, because the style of thought in them is very different. No critic can attribute the epistle to a Jewish Christian, for its genius is remote from Ebionitism. Many particulars belonging to it show a later writer putting himself into the apostolic age, as if he wished to be considered the apostle John. He has little of the concrete. No definite relations between the author and his readers appear. The individual element is all but absent. Had he been John himself, the apostle who had lived and laboured among the Christians about Ephesus and the surrounding district, we should have expected some life-like traits or special features distinguishing his readers and

pointing out their peculiar temptations. Instead of this, the epistle consists of abstract generalities.

The false teachers against whom the epistle is mainly directed, are antinomian Gnostics, who relied on their intellectual views, and neglected the practical virtues. Thus we read in ii. 4, 9, 11; iv. 7, 8: 'He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him;' 'He that saith he is in the light, and hateth his brother, is in darkness even until now;' 'But he that hateth his brother is in darkness, and walketh in darkness, and knoweth not whither he goeth, because that darkness hath blinded his eyes.' They are characterised as the *antichrists* of the last time, because they did not acknowledge Jesus as the Christ, and denied that he came in the flesh. Their christology was dualistic in separating the divine Christ from the human Jesus; as is plainly implied in v. 6: 'This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth.' These words represent the Gnostic view that the higher Christ descended upon the man Jesus at his baptism, and left him before he suffered death; in accordance with the statement of Irenæus against the heretics in question.[1]

The epistle combats the Gnostic separation of knowledge and conduct, of Jesus and Christ, by asserting the unalterable union of divine knowledge and observance of the commandments (ii. 3–5). In opposition to the Gnostic belief that the higher Christ could not suffer, the cleansing blood of Jesus Christ and his propitiatory offering of himself for the sins of the world are emphatically stated (i. 7; ii. 2; iv. 10). The protecting power presented against the errors of Gnosticism is the orthodox belief.

[1] 'Non enim Christus tunc (at his baptism) descendit in Jesum, neque alius quidem Christus, alius vero Jesus.'—*Advers. Hæres.* iii. 9, 3.

It is impossible to agree with the view of Wittichen that the errorists were Essene Ebionites. Still less can the hypothesis of Keim and Haupt be accepted, that the writer aimed at Cerinthus.

The polemic author did not emancipate himself from the Gnostic atmosphere of his time; for his thinking was influenced to some extent by the very persons whom he opposed. This appears most clearly in one passage: 'Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin because he is born of God' (iii. 9). Here we find a characteristic Gnostic term *seed* (the seed of God); by virtue of which a man *cannot* sin. The Ophite and Valentinian Christians held that this divine principle belongs to a part of mankind; and that its development brings them up to the highest attainable knowledge, or in other words, to perfection.[1] The inherent seed makes them sons of God. The sacred author admits divine sonship in true Christians when he writes: 'We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us . . . . every one that loveth, is born of God and knoweth God' (iv. 6, 7); but denies against the Gnostics, that they are the children of God who commit sin. 'Every one that doeth righteousness is born of Him' (ii. 29). Faith and love attest the existence of the divine seed, not the theoretical knowledge of God. Its outward development in virtuous conduct, not in barren spiritual apprehension, shows true sonship.[2]

While the author dwells upon love in opposition to Gnostic libertinism, he becomes pantheistic: 'He that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him.' His pantheism also appears in another context: 'He that keepeth His commandments dwelleth in Him, and He in him.' The higher *Gnosis* is tantamount to the indwelling of God.

[1] Comp. Irenæus, *Adv. Hæres.* i. 6, 4, 30.

[2] See Hilgenfeld's *Einleitung*, p. 690, etc.

The Gnosticism combated here did not exist in the time of John. Its germs may have appeared while he lived; but the advanced stage of it which the epistle opposes belongs to the second century. It is all but certain that the fiery apostle who wrote the Apocalypse and described God as wrathful, could not have concentrated his nature in *love*. Though the writer of the epistle sometimes speaks as if he wished to be taken for John, he has the belief of the catholic Church which was developed out of conflicting doctrines after the first century.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

The date of the epistle is a difficult question, and cannot be decided in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem. One passage adduced to prove that the city had not been destroyed when the epistle was written is an unsafe foundation to build upon (ii. 18); since the phrase *the last time* is applied even after that event, to the coming of Christ, in Ignatius's epistle to the Ephesians.[1] Düsterdieck is incorrect in supposing it to contain a prophetic glance at the impending crisis, and in dating the letter A.D. 70.[2] Nor does the silence of the writer respecting the fall of Jerusalem favour an early date, as Huther[3] believes, since the author's theme had no relation to Judaism.

The best way of arguing the question is—Was the letter written before or after the fourth gospel? Some critics assert that it contains plain references to the gospel; in support of which the first four or five verses are specially appealed to by Lücke, Hug, and Baur. We fail, however, to recognise the allusion, and cannot accept Baur's statement about the verses being a recapitu-

[1] Chapter xi.

[2] *Die drei Johanneischen Briefe*, vol. i. Einleitung, p. ciii.

[3] *Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über die drei Briefe des Johannes.* Einleit. p. 27.

lation of the gospel. The writer supposes that his readers were acquainted with evangelical truth; but does not intimate that he had instructed them, either by writing or orally, for the expressions *I write* and *I have written* refer to the present epistle; the past and present tenses being used interchangeably for the sake of variety. The repetition of the phrase *little children* may perhaps be intended to show familiarity between the writer and his readers; but Paul addresses the Galatians in the same manner. Still the frequent use of it leads to the belief that something more is meant than a mere expression of endearment.

If we could see with Baur, that a great part of the contents are but weak echoes of an original which far surpasses it and which the writer tries to imitate in matter and form; that there are reminiscences of the prologue of the fourth gospel in i. 5, etc.; and that ii. 7, 8, where the commandment of love is termed both new and old, refers to John xiii. 34, new in relation to the gospel, not new in the sense in which Jesus called it so, but old because they had it *from the beginning* (xv. 27); the priority of the gospel might be admitted.[1] But these presumptions are doubtful. Nor does greater probability attach to Lücke's argument about the shorter and contracted expressions of the epistle being later than the more copious and similar phrases of the gospel. Does this usually happen, even in the case of the same writer? The younger one is, the more forcible and terse his language; while it spreads out with age and loses strength. The soundness of the argument, therefore, based as it is on the abbreviated formulas of the epistle respecting the Word (i. 1, 2), compared with John i. 1, etc., and on iv. 2, contrasted with John i. 14, is questionable.

The epistle preceded the gospel. Its writer does not apply the title Word or Logos absolutely to Christ,

[1] *Theologische Jahrbücher von Baur und Zeller*, 7ter Band, p. 293, *et seq.*

as the author of the gospel does, which indicates a less advanced christology. He also expects the Redeemer's second advent personally to judge mankind, a view which the evangelist had left behind. Nor had he attained to the conception of the Spirit as *paraclete*, to that strong personification of the holy inspiration of Christians which proceeds from the Father and is implied in being sent by the Son, or in being the Son's representative in them, so much so that his coming is the coming of the Son into their souls.

If the priority of the epistle be admitted, the circumstance will lessen the surprise excited by the sudden appearance of a work like the fourth gospel, so far in advance of anything before it. An important link in the preparatory process is supplied. The wonderful development of Christian consciousness in the evangelist was materially aided by the epistle. The later author looked beyond and above the other, not merely because his inspiration was higher, but because he had the advantage of his work.

The exact date of the letter is uncertain, and we cannot come nearer it than A.D. 130. The place was Asia Minor.

PERSONS ADDRESSED.

Since the time of Augustine, the epistle has been often termed *ad Parthos*, to the Parthians, in the Latin church. It is so called by Augustine himself.[1] Vigilius Tapsensis, Cassiodorus, the Venerable Bede, with various Latin MSS., mention the same title; and one Greek MS., 62, has it at the end of the second epistle.[2] It is evident, however, that the Greek church, and the Latin

[1] In the treatise *Quæstionum Evangeliorum* lib. ii. quæst. 39. *Opp.* ed. Benedict. Paris, 1680, tom. iii. pars secunda, p. 266. The same inscription is also at the head of his tractates on the epistle; and in Possidius's *Indiculus Operum S. Augustini.*

[2] *ἰωάννου β' πρὸς πάρθους.*

too prior to Augustine, were ignorant of the inscription. Probably it originated in a mistake. Among the various conjectures put forth to explain its origin, the most probable is Gieseler's,[1] according to which the subscription of the first and second epistles was at first, *Epistle of John the Virgin*.[2] This the Latins misunderstanding, converted into *Epistle to the Parthians*. John was early styled *virgin* because he was unmarried. Whatever explanation be adopted, it is certain that the letter was not written to the Parthians. A Genevan codex is said to have *Sparthos* instead of *Parthos*, but Sabatier thinks that Dr. Patin, who says he saw the copy, mistook *Parthos* for *Sparthos*.[3] Yet Scholz describes such a copy there, with the inscription *ad Spartos*, and dates it in the twelfth century.[4]

The readers of the epistle were Gentile Christians. Hence they are warned against idolatry (v. 21), and docetism (iv. 1, etc.). There are no quotations from or allusions to the Old Testament. The author appears to be acquainted with the general state and prevailing temptations of those to whom he writes. The most likely view is, that the work was addressed to various churches of Asia Minor, including that of Ephesus. This agrees with its position among the *catholic* epistles.

THE FORM.

The work is commonly called John's first epistle, and has been styled so from an early period. It has little, however, of the epistolary form ; since inscription, salutation, and benediction are absent. But though the outward and common requisites of a formal epistle be wanting, its composition and texture show the propriety

[1] *Compendium of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. i. p. 106, English translation
[2] *ἐπιστ. ἰωάννου τοῦ παρθένου.*
[3] *Bibliorum Sacrorum latinæ versiones antiquæ*, vol. iii. p. 965
[4] *Biblisch-kritische Reise*, u. s. w., pp. 66, 67.

of the name. The readers are sometimes addressed in the second person ; there are references to their condition, a loose connection of ideas, frequent repetitions, and other peculiarities of a colloquial style. Hence it cannot be called a *treatise* or *discourse* ; nor should it be connected with the gospel, as though it were either its polemic or its practical part. It is not an accompaniment of the gospel, an introduction and preface commending John's work on the Logos to the entire Church, as Hug would have it. To link it to the larger work is to present it in a wrong aspect, because it is composed in a different method. The oldest MSS. and versions have them apart. Why were they not put together, if the one was a supplement to or companion of the other ? To this question Hug answers that the copyist of D. furnishes the requisite evidence of what was the ancient practice. On the first page of the leaf on whose opposite side the Acts of the Apostles begin, he wrote the Latin column of the last verse belonging to John's third epistle, and subjoined words to the effect that the Acts now commence,[1] whence the critic infers that the copyist had an old MS. before him, in which John's epistles immediately preceded the Acts. This argument proves too much, because it makes all three accompaniments of or introductions to the fourth gospel.

OCCASION AND OBJECT.

The writer has a polemic purpose, since he speaks in condemnation of antichrists or false teachers (ii. 18–26) ; and of spirits who did not acknowledge Christ's true humanity (iv. 1–6). The opening part of the

[1] 'Epistulæ Johannis iii.
explicit
incipit
Acta Apostolorum.'—See Kipling's facsimile, p. 657, pars altera.

letter points to the same persons. These can be none other than Gnostics who separated the person of Jesus Christ into two distinct parts. The author himself states his leading object: 'These things have I written unto you that ye may know ye have eternal life while believing in the name of the Son of God' (v. 13). This is a purpose comprehensive enough to embrace different things; and accordingly the writer frequently introduces such phrases as *I write* or *I have written*, accompanied with a variety of statements. Thus in i. 4 he has 'these things write we unto you that your joy may be full.' He takes his stand upon catholic doctrine and combats the false teachers of his time, the libertine Gnostics in whom the spirit of antichrist appeared, and whose views of matter and gnosis led them to deny the faith. Christians are exhorted to mutual love and the keeping of the commandments; they are reminded of their communion with the Father and the Son, and of the desirableness of holding fast their present position against the errorists around them. Thus the epistle is polemic.

INTEGRITY.

There was once a protracted controversy respecting the words in v. 7, 8; 'in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one; and there are three that bear witness on earth.' At the present day it is universally admitted that they are spurious, the evidence of MSS., versions, and fathers being clearly against them. It would seem strange that champions should have appeared in their favour after the masterly treatise of Porson,[1] did we not know that theological error lingers long. Hence the persevering efforts of Bishop Bur-

[1] *Letters to Mr. Archdeacon Travis, in answer to his Defence of the Three Heavenly Witnesses, 1 John, v. 7.* 1790. 8vo.

gess; the feeble attempt of Sander; and the perverse criticism of Forster. We need not state the evidence for and against the passage, since it has been given elsewhere.[1] Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tischendorf omit the words.

In ii. 23, the clause, 'he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also,' is usually printed in italics in English Bibles, because its genuineness was once considered doubtful. But it is amply attested by external evidence, being in the most ancient and best MSS., ℵ, A., B., C., etc. Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tischendorf receive it into the text.

CONTENTS.

It would occupy much space to give the different divisions of the epistle adopted by critics. It may be divided into four parts and an introduction. These parts, however, are not separated from one another externally, but lie in the ideas of the writer rather than their outward expression. They are: i. 5–ii. 11; ii. 12–29; iii. 1–22; iii. 23–v. 21. The introduction consists of the first four verses and indicates the theme of the whole.

i. 5–ii. 11. This portion is pervaded by the contrast between walking in darkness and walking in light. Light and darkness are the two opposites set forth. The author reminds his readers of the ground of communion with the Father and the Son, the holy nature of God, and the purity indispensable to fellowship with Him. This communion implies, first, purification and redemption by the death of Christ. The idea of purification is then developed. Its conditions are, the perception and confession of sin as well as repentance for it; and should one fall into sin notwithstanding, he has an advocate in Christ (i. 5–ii. 2).

[1] Davidson's *Treatise on Biblical Criticism*, vol. ii. p. 403, etc.

Communion implies, secondly, the keeping of God's commandments, especially that of love. In introducing love as the great commandment, the author asserts that he does not write about a new thing, but one with which they were acquainted from the commencement of their Christian life. Yet it was new in one aspect, not only because it had been revealed by Christ, but because it had a new and quickening power over their life. The paragraph ends with walking in darkness as it had begun with walking in light; the respective characteristics of those who hate and love the brethren (ii. 3–11).

ii. 12–29. In the second division the leading idea is the world, which takes the place of darkness in the preceding part. The Christian has overcome the world. Here the writer addresses his readers directly, in order to quicken and elevate their Christian consciousness. He individualises various classes to give variety and definiteness to his description. Love of the world; false teachers who had not true faith in Christ because they denied the Son and consequently the Father; abiding in Christ, are referred to. The closing exhortation is to abide in the Father and the Son. If the Christian has overcome the world, he must hold fast what he has, by abiding in the Father and the Son.

iii. 1–22. The leading idea of the third part is sonship. Communion with God is a relation of sonship founded in the love of God. How great is the evidence of the divine love towards believers in making them children of God! The hope of being like God must lead to holiness. Sin is incompatible with Christ's redemption, fellowship with him, and sonship. So far from having any association with God and Christ, it rather belongs to the devil (iii. 1–10). He reminds his readers again of the commandment of love, pointing out the inconsistency of hatred to brethren with eternal life, exhorting them to self-sacrificing love in imitation of Christ, to compassion for distressed brethren, and to the active

manifestation of love (iii. 11–18). By the habitual temper of our minds and loving conduct to others we have, says he, a good conscience before God and are sure of being heard in prayer, because we do what is pleasing in His sight, maintain fellowship with Him by faith and love, and possess His Spirit (19–22).

iii. 23–v. 21. Belief or faith is the leading idea of this section. The highest point to which the epistle arrives is belief in the name of the Son. Such faith is accompanied with mutual love and the keeping of God's commandments. Christians are admonished to prove the spirit of the teachers who appeared. And this is the test given—if they acknowledge the manifestation of Jesus Christ in the flesh, they are genuine; if they deny it they belong to antichrist and the world. Love constitutes the essence of God, and he that loves is His child. God's love has been shown in the sending of His Son; and as He loved us we ought to love one another; for by love we have fellowship with Him (iii. 23–iv. 12).

The characteristic mark of communion is the possession of the Christian spirit, which holds fast and confesses that the Father sent the Son as the Saviour of the world; that Jesus is the Son of God; and that God has revealed himself as love (iv. 13–16).

The consummation of love is seen in Christians having confidence at the day of judgment, and no fear before God. Let us therefore, says the author, love Him, and we shall love the brethren also (iv. 17–21).

Whoever believes in Christ is a child of God. Such an one loves his brethren and keeps God's commandments (v. 1–5).

Jesus is certified to be the Son of God by water, blood, and the Spirit, in the reception or rejection of which testimony belief and unbelief appear (v. 6–10). The essential practical import of this testimony is, that God has given eternal life through Jesus

Christ (v. 11–13). He refers as before to confidence in God as the fruit of perfect love, connected with the hearing of prayer and especially of intercessory prayer on behalf of sinning brethren when they do not commit mortal transgression; for a child of God cannot sin, by virtue of his communion with Him and the knowledge of the true God given by the Son. A warning against idolatry concludes the letter (v. 14–21).

From this analysis it will appear that the epistle is ethical and mystic, not speculative. As the general tone is calm, subdued, mild, serene, it is not surprising that it should be attributed to the aged John in the evening of life. The different parts are not wholly unconnected as some have imagined; but no logical method is followed. The language is more that of feeling than of intellect. The critic is puzzled in trying to find the definite sequence of parts, though he is able to trace the general course of thought. The transitions of ideas are feebly marked, or left to be understood. A good interpreter will endeavour to get a right view of the leading ideas, especially of the manner in which they rise out of one another. Admitting disjointedness in the materials he will not tax his ingenuity with finding accurate constructions, order, precision, and completeness.

Very different judgments have been pronounced on the letter, showing how much depends on the taste of critics. Eichhorn speaks of its rhapsodical character; and attributes its want of order to failure of memory on the part of John. Baur speaks of the absence of freshness and colour, its childish and weak repetitions, its want of energy; language that needs some qualification. On the contrary, Hilgenfeld pronounces it rich and original in what relates to the subjective life of Christianity; affirming that its fresh, living, attractive character consists in its taking us with fondness into the inner experience of genuine Christian life. This language also requires correction. We are disposed to

take a higher estimate of it than Baur's ; a lower than Hilgenfeld's. The epistle has a certain attractiveness, and its sentences are not wholly without power. The author depicts the Christian life with considerable freshness. He moves, without logical ability, in a region of abstract ideas tinged with mysticism. The region is a confined one, and the author's vocabulary is the same. His thoughts are neither full nor rich ; and the meagre language produces monotony. He repeats himself too much, and weakens the impression of what he writes ; a fact which cannot be explained away by the hortatory and tender nature of the epistle, still less by a Hebraistic form which does not really belong to it.

More value would be assigned to the work if the fourth gospel were not put beside it. To be judged impartially, it should be placed apart.

A peculiar idea appears in the epistle, viz. that the true Christian does not sin, but purifies himself as Christ is pure : 'Whosoever abideth in him *sinneth not* ; whosoever sinneth hath not seen him neither known him.' 'Whosoever is born of God *doth not commit sin* ; for his seed remaineth in him ; and *he cannot sin* because he is born of God.' These singularly strong expressions shaped by Gnosticism itself, approach the Montanistic principle that *pneumatic* Christians are the pure organs of the spirit. Montanism and Gnosticism had their points of contact. But it would be hazardous to assert that Montanism proper is in the epistle, in the distinction between venial and deadly sins or in the mention of murder and idolatry as two out of the three special mortal sins. That system indeed arose in the Johannine circle of ideas ; and one of its fundamental ideas, that the Christian is living in the very end of the world, is emphasized by the present writer. The Montanists were enthusiastic millennarians. Hence the proximity of some statements to the Montanism of Tertullian and

others. A divine consciousness is supposed to dwell in the readers of the epistle, by which they know all things; and the Montanists distinguished themselves as *pneumatic*[1] from the *psychical*[2] or ordinary Christians who did not adopt their rigid system.

With all its practical morality and Gnostic tinge, the epistle has a resemblance to the Pauline theology. This may appear strange in one who writes in John's name. But when the Judaistic basis of genuine Johannine Christianity was set aside, or rather when it was metamorphosed into a free and profound theology, it was hardly possible to avoid a Pauline colour; although the Paulinism diverted from its true type approaches the modified form exhibited in the epistle to the Hebrews.

[1] πνευματικοί. [2] ψυχικοί.

THE SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF JOHN.

AUTHORSHIP.

THE TRADITION that the second and third epistles commonly ascribed to John were written by the apostle, is ancient.

In the Greek church Clemens Alexandrinus is the first who speaks of a second as well as a first epistle of John; calling the latter the larger one.[1] Of the second he says, it was written 'to virgins,' and is very simple. It was addressed to one Babylonian named Electa.[2] Eusebius states that Clement explained the catholic epistles in his 'Hypotyposes' or Outlines.[3] If so he adopted the third as well as the second.

Origen mentions the two epistles, and tells us that they were not received by some in his day. He neither gives his own opinion nor quotes from them.[4]

Dionysius of Alexandria admitted them as apostolic productions, which appears from the use he makes of them in arguing that John did not write the Apocalypse: 'Nor yet in the second and third epistles ascribed to John, though they are but short letters, is the name of John prefixed, for without a name he is termed "the elder."'[5]

[1] ἡ μείζων ἐπιστολή.—*Stromata*, lib. ii. p. 464, ed. Potter.

[2] 'Secunda Joannis epistola, quæ ad virgines scripta est, simplicissima est. Scripta vero est ad quandam Babyloniam Electam nomine.'—*Adumbrat.* ed. Potter, p. 1001. The fragment may not be authentic.

[3] *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 14.

[4] Ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25.

[5] ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ φερομένῃ Ἰωάννου καὶ τρίτῃ, καίτοι βραχείαις

Alexander of Alexandria quotes the second epistle, assigning it to John the apostle: 'For it becomes us as Christians . . . . . not to say to such God speed, lest we be partakers of their sins, as the blessed John directs.' [1]

It is unnecessary to quote Athanasius, Didymus, and others who received the epistles as canonical works of the apostle. The Alexandrian church generally was favourable to their Johannine authorship.

With respect to the Western church, Irenæus quotes the second epistle, attributing it to 'John the Lord's disciple.' [2]

Neither Tertullian nor Cyprian quotes them. This silence, however, is no proof that they were not recognised in the north African church. Aurelius, bishop of Chollabi, at a synod held at Carthage under Cyprian (A.D. 256), appealed to 2 John 10, as the words of John the apostle.[3]

The Muratorian canon mentions two epistles of John. But the passage is not clear; and the text of it may be corrupt, as is not unfrequently the case.[4]

In the Syrian church the letters were not received at first, because they are wanting in the Peshito. But Ephrem in the fourth century quotes both, introducing the ninth verse of the second with 'the word of John the divine;' and the fourth verse of the third with 'the Scripture says.' [5] Hence it is probable that he referred both to the apostle.

οὔσαις ἐπιστολαῖς, ὁ Ἰωάννης ὀνομαστὶ πρόκειται, ἀλλ' ἀνωνύμως ὁ πρεσβύτερος γέγραπται.—Ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 25.

[1] πρέπει γὰρ ἡμᾶς ὡς Χριστιανοὺς ὄντας κατὰ Χριστοῦ . . . μὴ δὲ κἂν χαίρειν τοῖς τοιούτοις λέγειν· ἵνα μήποτε καὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις αὐτῶν κοινωνοὶ γενώμεθα, ὡς παρήγγειλεν ὁ μακάριος Ἰωάννης, κ.τ.λ.—Ap. Socrat. *H. E.* lib. i. c. 6.

[2] *Adv. Hæres.* i. c. 16.

[3] *Cypriani Opp.* p. 337, ed. Maran. 1726.

[4] 'Epistula sane Judæ et superscripti Johannis duas in catholica habentur.'

[5] *De Amore Pauperum*, vol. iii. p. 52; and *Ad Imitat. Proverb.* vol. i. p. 76, ed. Assemanus, 1732-1746.

Eusebius puts them among the Antilegomena, perhaps with relation to Origen's reserve and their exclusion from the old Syriac version. What his own opinion was is not clear. In his 'Ecclesiastical History' he speaks doubtfully, in such terms as these, 'whether they are of the evangelist or of some other of the same name;'[1] but in his 'Evangelical Demonstration' he assigns them to the apostle: 'In his epistles, he either makes no mention of himself, or calls himself *elder* merely, nowhere apostle or evangelist.'[2] Here the historian seems to refer to the three epistles, speaking of them as the evangelist's or apostle's. But this affords no certain proof that he was persuaded they were all written by one and the same person. It is a sufficient foundation for the remark that they were generally, or by many, attributed to the apostle. As for himself, he has plainly shown by what he says elsewhere, and by not quoting the last two epistles, that he was not satisfied of their being written by the apostle and evangelist.

After Eusebius the letters came to be generally received. They are in the apostolic canons, and in the sixtieth canon of the council at Laodicea. They were also recognised by the councils of Hippo (A.D. 393) and of Carthage (A.D. 397).

In the time of Jerome they were commonly put with the other catholic epistles. But there were still doubts of them in the minds of some: 'The other two, whose beginning is *the elder*, are said to have been written by John the presbyter, whose sepulchre is shown at Ephesus till this day.'[3] In another place he speaks of that opinion as 'handed down by most.'[4]

In the decree of Damasus they are assigned to John

[1] *H. E.* iii. 25.

[2] *D. E.* iii. 5, p. 215, ed. Migne.

[3] 'Reliquæ autem duæ, quarum principium *senior* . . . . . Joannis presbyteri asseruntur, cujus et hodie alterum sepulchrum apud Ephesios ostenditur.'—*De Vir. Illustr.* c. 9.

[4] 'Opinio a plerisque tradita.'

the presbyter (not the apostle); and Amphilochius of Iconium speaks as if they were disputed.

In the school of Antioch they found least favour. Theodore of Mopsuestia rejected them. Theodoret never mentions them; and in the homily on Matt. xxi. 23 ascribed to Chrysostom, but not his, the fathers are said to hold them as uncanonical.[1]

The voice of the Syrian church generally is against their apostolicity.

Thus antiquity is divided respecting them, though the evidence on the whole is in their favour.

As internal evidence for the apostolicity of the epistles, it is alleged that the sentiments and language bear the marks of John the apostle; for which purpose they are compared with the first epistle and fourth gospel. But this reasoning is inconclusive, because John the apostle did not write the latter. To prove their apostolic origin the two epistles should be paralleled with the Apocalypse. The resemblance of the second to the first is so close that eight of the thirteen verses of which the former consists are said to be found in the latter, either in sense or expression.[2] Parallels are abundant, as *to abide in one* (2 John 2, 9);[3] *to have the Father and the Son* (2 John 9);[4] *to see God* (3 John 11);[5] *to be of God* (3 John 11);[6] *joy . . . . . full* (2 John 12);[7] *ye have heard from the beginning* (2 John 6);[8] *this . . . . . that* (2 John 6).[9] The same thing is affirmed and denied at the same place (2 John 9). A more definite explanation is subjoined by opposites, *not . . . . . but* (2 John 5, etc.).[10]

Yet there are departures from the phraseology of the

[1] *τὴν γὰρ δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην οἱ πατέρες ἀποκανονίζονται.*—*Opp.* ed. Montfaucon, vol. vi. p. 430.

[2] See Mill's prolegomena to his edition of the Greek Testament, 153.

[3] *μένειν ἔν τινι.*

[4] *ἔχειν τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν.*

[5] *ὁρᾷν τὸν Θεόν.*

[6] *ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι.*

[7] *χαρὰ . . . πεπληρωμένη.*

[8] *ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.*

[9] *αὕτη . . . ἵνα.*

[10] *οὐ . . . ἀλλά.*

first epistle and fourth gospel, such as εἴ τις for ἐάν τις (2 John 10); *to bring doctrine* (2 John 10);[1] *to be partaker of* (2 John 11);[2] *to walk after* (2 John 6);[3] *to do faithfully* (3 John 5).[4] βλέπειν with the reflexive pronoun (2 John 8) is peculiar; so is the verb ἐπιδέχεσθαι (3 John 9, 10). ἀπολαμβάνειν (2 John 8; 3 John 8), and ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί (2 John 7) for ἐληλυθότα ἐν σ., are also foreign to the first epistle. These deviations do not destroy the force of the argument contained in the resemblances. But the similarity of thought and language to the first epistle does not prove identity of authorship. It may show nothing more than imitation on the part of him who wrote the second and third epistles. A writer familiar with the first letter may have echoed its sentiments and expressions.

The author specifies himself, contrary to the usage of John the apostle, as *the elder*. If therefore a person so designated be known in early history, it is natural to fix upon him. John the elder lived at Ephesus, as we learn from Papias, and very near the time of the apostle.

The tenth verse of the second epistle is inconsistent with the character of an apostle: 'If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed.' This language breathes a different spirit from that of the first epistle. It is the part of Christian love to rebuke the erring not to thrust them away; whereas the common duties of hospitality are here forbidden. Whatever John the apostle may have been once, a Boanerges, fiery and impetuous, the expressions employed in this place are unlike the aged apostle at Ephesus, and are unworthy of a true Christian. The obstinate resistance of Diotrephes to the writer's counsels does not harmonise

[1] φέρειν τὴν διδαχήν. [2] κοινωνεῖν.
[3] περιπατεῖν κατά. [4] πιστὸν ποιεῖν.

with the authority of an apostle like John in his old age. Diotrephes resisted, and prated against him with malicious words. He excluded persons from the church, contrary to the writer's express recommendation. Who he was we cannot tell; but that an ambitious officer or individual belonging to a neighbouring church should have set himself up against the aged John after this fashion, is extremely improbable.

The two epistles, which proceeded from one author, were written by the elder as they profess to be; that is by John of Ephesus. The opinion that the apostle wrote them was never unanimous in the ancient Church. The two Johns were sometimes confounded, as they have been with respect to the authorship of the epistles. The late reception of the letters was owing to various causes, their brevity, their private and personal character, their doctrinal unimportance, their supposed want of apostolicity as shown by the contents, and the title *elder* at the beginning.

TO WHOM THEY WERE ADDRESSED.

The former is addressed to 'the elect lady and her children.' What is meant by the original of these words? Not 'to Kyria, the chosen or elect,' because the Greek article would have stood before 'the chosen,'[1] as analogous examples in the thirteenth verse; with 3 John 1; Rom. xvi. 5, 8–13, attest. Lücke indeed appeals to 1 Peter i. 1, for a parallel without the article, but the case is different; the word translated *strangers*[2] not being a proper name. Not 'to the lady Electa,' because the position of the words would have been different;[3] because it is doubtful if the Greeks used *κύρια* of females along with their names; and chiefly because the thirteenth verse intimates on this principle that the

[1] τῇ ἐκλεκτῇ. [2] παρεπιδήμοις.
[3] τῇ κυρίᾳ ἐκλεκτῇ, or ἐκλεκτῇ τῇ κυρίᾳ.

sister's name was also Electa. This last consideration appeared so strong to Grotius, that he conjectured a different reading. The words refer to a particular Christian Church, *to the elect church.* Even Jerome referred κύρια to the church generally; and though the word occurs nowhere else in this sense, it is natural for a Christian church to be called so, because of its relation to the Lord.[1] *The children* are the individual members of the Church. The contents of the letter agree with this sense. There is no individual reference to one person; on the contrary, the children 'walk in truth;' mutual love is enjoined; there is an admonition, 'look to yourselves;' and 'the bringing of doctrine' is mentioned. It is also improbable that 'the children of an elect sister' would send a greeting by the writer to an 'elect Kyria and her children.' A sister church might well salute another.

The third epistle is addressed to Gaius. Several persons of that name are mentioned in the New Testament, such as Gaius of Macedonia (Acts xix. 29); Gaius of Corinth (1 Cor. i. 14; Rom. xvi. 23); and Gaius of Derbe (Acts xx. 4). Mill and Whiston identified him with Caius, bishop of Pergamus, on the authority of the Apostolical Constitutions; but Cönen thinks he was the Corinthian Gaius, and that the church to which the elder writes was that of Corinth.[2] This is merely conjectural. The opinion of Whiston is the most probable. The Apostolic Constitutions mention as bishops not only Gaius of Pergamus, but Demetrius of Philadelphia, who may be the very persons specified in the epistle. It is pretty clear that he was a man of distinction in the church, since the writer commends certain strangers to his hospitality.

[1] κύριος.

[2] *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1872, p. 264, etc.

OCCASION AND OBJECT.

Nothing is known of the occasion on which the second epistle was written except what can be gathered from itself. The purport of it is to establish the church in Christian truth and love, as well as to warn it against false teachers. Unlike the first epistle, it is a kind of official document, but is directed against the same class of Gnostics, and proceeds from the same locality.

The object of the third is to commend certain brethren and strangers to Gaius—travelling preachers who needed hospitality and help. As the author expected to see Gaius shortly, he writes briefly. Demetrius, named in the twelfth verse, has been thought to be one of the brethren or strangers referred to, perhaps the bearer of the letter. It is unlikely that he held office in the church of which Gaius was a member, because his character would be known too well to need the author's commendation.

Baur[1] has a peculiar hypothesis respecting the origin of these epistles. There was a division, he supposes, in the church to which Gaius belonged. One party, with Diotrephes at its head, refused communion to the writer; the other party were satisfied with that communion. The cause of such schism is found in the Montanist commotions. The epistles were written to the Montanistic part of the Roman church, Diotrephes being a symbolical appellation for the bishop, Soter, Anicetus, or Eleutherus. The passionate zeal of the epistolary author goes so far as to regard the adherents of Diotrephes as heathens (3 John 9). Some one personating the apostolic head of the church in Asia Minor wrote thus against the pretensions of the Roman episcopate. Baur lays great stress on the passage already quoted from Clemens Alexandrinus, which says that the epistle

[1] *Theolog. Jahrbücher* for 1848, p. 328, etc.

was addressed to a certain Babylonian Electa, i.e. the Roman church (Babylon meaning Rome), where the views of the members were divided respecting Montanism; and supposes the words 'written to virgins' have respect to the Montanistic view of the Church being Christ's spouse, chaste and holy. Surely this procedure on the part of a Montanist was an unlikely one to accomplish his purpose. Besides, the epistles bear no marks of Montanism. Tertullian himself never refers to or uses them. Like the first epistle, the second alludes to Gnosticism, whose promoters are termed antichrist (2 John 7, etc.). Probably a church not far from Ephesus is addressed.

It has been inferred from a word used respecting Diotrephes[1] that John wrote an epistle to the church of which Gaius was a member, which is now lost, '*I wrote* to the church' (3 John 9). This is probable; and perhaps Diotrephes intercepted the letter. To evade the notion of a lost epistle, some translate, 'I would have written,' which is favoured by several MSS. inserting a conditional particle,[2] and by the Vulgate version.[3] The epistle in question cannot have been the first epistle of John now extant, nor that in which the expression itself, 'I wrote,' occurs, because the one contains nothing pertinent to the matter, and the tense of the verb does not suit the other.

TIME AND PLACE.

These epistles are later than the first, because the writer of them uses its ideas and language. They were also nearly contemporaneous, the third following the second as Lücke supposes, since the latter says, 'I trust to come unto you;' the former, 'I trust I shall *shortly* see thee.' The one journey is intended in both.

The place was probably near Ephesus, John's abode; the time soon after A.D. 130.

[1] ἔγραψα. [2] ἄν. [3] 'Scripsissem forsitan.'

CONTENTS.

The second epistle, after a salutation in which the writer commends the church and its members, expresses his joy in finding the Christians there living according to the faith of the gospel; exhorts them to mutual love, and warns against false teachers denying the proper humanity of Christ, who ought not to receive the slightest encouragement. The epistle ends with an expression of the author's intention to visit them, and a salutation (1–13).

In the third, after a salutation, and an introduction breathing good wishes, the well-known hospitality of Gaius to travelling Christians is commended; and he is encouraged in the exercise of it towards persons who had recently gone forth to the Gentiles but wished to depend for support on their Christian brethren. The author then speaks against Diotrephes, an opponent of his authority, and recommends Demetrius to the attention of Gaius. In conclusion, a purpose is expressed of visiting his friend soon; and a salutation from the Christian friends associated with him is subjoined (1–14).

THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

AUTHORSHIP.

THE WRITER of this epistle styles himself Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James. Several persons named Judas or Jude are mentioned in the New Testament, only two of whom at present come before us, viz. Jude, a brother of our Lord, spoken of in Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3, and another referred to in Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13. The latter is called *brother* of James in the English version; but his relationship to James is not specified in the original. He may have been *the son* of James, i.e. of James, the son of Alphæus, or the son of another James.

It is generally admitted that when Jude describes himself as a brother of James, he points to a well-known James, i.e. the James often called bishop of Jerusalem, who was the Lord's brother. The writer was not an apostle, and does not say he was. He styles himself brother of James. Why should he call himself brother of another person, if he possessed independent authority and apostleship? It is of no avail to say that Paul omits the title *apostle* in several of his epistles, because the cases are dissimilar. It was well known from some of his letters who he was; whereas Jude wrote no more than one brief epistle.[1] We cannot therefore identify the present Jude with the apostle

[1] Jessien, *De Authentia Epistolæ Judæ commentatio critica*, p. 2, *et seq.*

Jude or Judas surnamed Lebbeus or Thaddeus, though the latter is termed 'brother of James' in Luke vi. 16, in our English version. Besides, he distinguishes himself from the apostles: 'But, beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ; how that *they* told you there should be mockers in the last time, who should walk after their own ungodly lusts' (verses 17, 18). The reasoning of Arnaud on this language is far-fetched: 'He distinguishes himself from the apostles as an individual, but not necessarily as to his class, that is to say, his rank as an apostle.'[1] Is not that special pleading? Some think that he would have called himself the Lord's brother, had he really been so, because the circumstance would have given weight to his letter; but we cannot tell the reasons that influenced him, whether humility or a higher sense of the relation between the Son of God and himself. The language of Hegesippus implies that he was esteemed on account of his relationship to Christ, and was dead in the time of Domitian.[2]

AUTHENTICITY.

Clement of Alexandria refers to the epistle in the following places: 'For I would have you know, says Jude, that God once,' etc. etc.[3] In another place he writes: 'It was respecting these, I suppose, and similar heresies, that Jude in his epistle said prophetically,' etc.[4] Eusebius says of him, 'In his Outlines, Clement had made short explanations of all the canonical scriptures, not omitting those which are disputed, I

[1] *On the Authorship of the Epistle of Jude*, translated in the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review* for 1859, p. 497 and following.

[2] Ap. Eusebius's *H. E.* iii. 20.

[3] *εἰδέναι γὰρ ὑμᾶς, φησὶν ὁ Ἰούδας, βούλομαι, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἅπαξ, κ.τ.λ.*—*Pædagog.* lib. iii. p. 239, ed. Sylburg.

[4] *ἐπὶ τούτων οἶμαι καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων αἱρέσεων προφητικῶς Ἰούδαν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ εἰρηκέναι.*—*Stromata*, iii. p. 431.

mean Jude's and the other catholic epistles.'[1] Clement seems to have used the epistle as apostolic, though he does not call the writer an apostle.

Tertullian apparently thought that it was written by an apostle: 'Enoch possesses a testimony in Jude the apostle.'[2]

The Muratorian fragment on the canon speaks uncertainly about the epistle, the text being probably corrupt in the place.[3] Credner understands the writer to say that the two epistles of John and that of Jude have a place in the canon, on the same ground as that on which the Wisdom of Solomon was admitted into the Christian, though excluded from the Jewish, canon. But Wieseler interprets the meaning as if the epistle of Jude and others were received in the catholic Church.

Origen writes: 'Jude wrote a letter, of few verses indeed, but full of powerful words of heavenly grace,' etc.[4] In another place: 'But if any one receives also the epistle of Jude, let him consider what will follow from what is there said,' etc.[5] 'And many of the heavenly beings, even of the first, become the last, being kept in everlasting chains in darkness unto the judgment of the great day.'[6] 'And in the epistle of Jude, "To them that are beloved in God the Father,

[1] *ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὑποτυπώσεσι πάσης τῆς ἐνδιαθήκου γραφῆς ἐπιτετμημένας πεποίηται διηγήσεις, μὴ δὲ τὰς ἀντιλεγόμενας παρελθών· τὴν Ἰούδα λέγω καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς καθολικὰς ἐπιστολάς.—H. E.* vi. 14.

[2] 'Enoch apud Judam apostolum testimonium possidet.'—*De Habitu Fœminarum*, c. 3.

[3] 'Epistola sane Judæ et superscripti Johannis duas in catholica habentur.' 'In catholica' means *in the catholic Church*, ecclesia being understood. But Bunsen alters *catholica* into catholicis, and then the sense is, that the epistle of Jude and 1 & 2 John are reckoned among the catholic epistles.

[4] *Ἰούδας ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολὴν ὀλιγόστιχον μέν, πεπληρωμένην δὲ τῶν τῆς οὐρανίου χάριτος ἐῤῥωμένων λόγων.—Comment. in Matt.* vol. iii. p. 463, ed. Delarue.

[5] *εἰ δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἰούδα πρόσοιτό τις ἐπιστολήν, ὁράτω τί ἔπεται τῷ λόγῳ, διὰ τό· ἀγγέλους τε, κ.τ.λ.—Ibid.* vol. iii. p. 814.

[6] *καὶ γίγνονται πολλοὶ μὲν τῶν οὐρανίων καὶ πρώτων ἔσχατοι, εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ἐν ζόφῳ τηρούμενοι.—Ibid.* vol. iii. p. 693.

and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called."'[1] In other parts of his works existing in a Latin translation only, Origen calls Jude an *apostle*, and quotes his letter as *divine Scripture*.[2]

Eusebius puts the epistle among the *controverted* books, saying of it: 'Of the controverted, but yet well known to many, are that called the epistle of James, that of Jude,' etc.[3] Again: 'Not many of the ancients have made mention of it [the epistle of James], neither of that called Jude's, which is likewise one of the epistles termed *catholic*. We know, however, that these also are publicly read in most churches along with the rest.'[4]

Jerome writes: 'Jude, the brother of James, left a small epistle indeed, which belongs to the seven catholic ones. And because in it he takes a testimony from the book of Enoch which is apocryphal, it is rejected by most. However, it has already obtained such authority by antiquity and use, that it is reckoned among the sacred Scriptures.'[5]

It is also quoted as Scripture in the treatise of an unknown author addressed to Novatian ('sicut scriptum est') Jude 14, 15.[6]

On the other hand, the epistle is wanting in the Peshito. But Ephrem recognised the apostolic origin.

[1] καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἰούδα ἐπιστολῇ, τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοις, καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετερημένοις, κλητοῖς.—*Comment. in Matt.* p. 607, ed. Delarue.

[2] Comp. *Comment. in Ep. ad Rom.* lib. iii.—*Opp.* iv. p. 510. *Ibid.* lib. iv. p. 549; *De Principiis*, iii. 2 (tom. i. p. 138).

[3] τῶν δ' ἀντιλεγομένων, γνωρίμων δ' οὖν ὅμως τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἡ λεγομένη Ἰακώβου φέρεται, καὶ ἡ Ἰούδα, κ.τ.λ.—*H. E.* iii. 25.

[4] οὐ πολλοὶ γοῦν τῶν παλαιῶν αὐτῆς ἐμνημόνευσαν, ὡς οὐδὲ τῆς λεγομένης Ἰούδα, μιᾶς καὶ αὐτῆς οὔσης τῶν ἑπτὰ λεγομένων καθολικῶν· ὅμως δὲ ἴσμεν καὶ ταύτας μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐν πλείσταις δεδημοσιουμένας ἐκκλησίαις.—*H. E.* ii. 23.

[5] 'Judas frater Jacobi, parvam quidem, quæ de septem catholicis est, epistolam reliquit. Et quia de libro Enoch, qui apocryphus est, in eo assumit testimonium, a plerisque rejicitur; tamen auctoritatem vetustate jam et usu meruit, ut inter sacras Scripturas computetur.'—*Catal. Script. Eccles.* c. 4.

[6] *Adv. Novat. Hæret.* p. xvii. ed. Baluz, 1726.

Justin Martyr, Theophilus of Antioch, and Irenæus do not mention it.

During the fourth century, the letter was taken into the canon along with other disputed works, and was thenceforward treated like the epistles of apostolic origin. Theodore of Mopsuestia rejected it, according to Leontius of Byzantium.

External evidence is divided as to its being written by Jude, James's brother or Jude the apostle. It is also discordant about its early reception as a canonical writing.

The objections to its authenticity are not all valid. Thus it is said that an apocryphal production is quoted in it. We know from Didymus of Alexandria and Jerome, that this fact was an early stumbling-block in the way of its reception. Whether it was the sole cause is questionable.

The book of Enoch was written before the time of Jude, so that he could easily quote it. That part of it at least from which the citation is taken, is prior to the Christian era, as has been shown by Dillmann[1] and others.

But did Jude really quote the book? Cave, Simon, and others, supposing that he only cited a traditional prophecy or saying of Enoch, subsequently incorporated in the apocryphal work, answer in the negative. But the foundation of this opinion is erroneous, because the prophecy already existed in writing; and the language 'Enoch prophesied, *saying*,' is consistent with that fact, since the apostle Paul introduces quotations from the Old Testament by 'Esaias *saith*,' 'David *saith*.' In quoting from a book, it need not be inferred that Jude stamps it with authority. The apostle Paul cites several heathen poets; who supposes that he renders their productions of greater intrinsic value than they really are? His sanction extends no farther than the

[1] *Das Buch Henoch*, Allgemeine Einleit. p. 43, etc.

place he alludes to. Besides, an apocryphal work like Enoch's may have contained some correct statements. It is also thought that Jude quotes an apocryphal book in the ninth verse, when he speaks of a dispute between Michael the archangel and the devil about the body of Moses. In Origen's opinion, the *Ascension of Moses* was the source of the quotation. Lardner supposes the reference to be to Zechariah (iii. 1, etc.) ; but the cases are not identical, because there is nothing in the prophet about Moses's body or Michael or a dispute about the body. The resistance of Satan to the angel refers to Joshua's consecration. Besides, it is the Lord not an angel who rebukes Satan. Others conjecture that Jude refers to a Jewish tradition founded on Deut. xxxiv. 6, and subsequently amplified. God left the burial of Moses to Michael, but Satan withstood it, accusing Moses of being a murderer, and declaring him undeserving of honourable interment. Such is Jonathan's paraphrastic addition to Deut. xxxiv. 6. It is most probable that the expression, 'The Lord rebuke thee' was taken from the *Ascension of Moses.* Christian writers frequently adopted Jewish traditions, including Paul himself, who speaks of angels taking part in the promulgation of the law (Gal. iii. 19) ; and of the water from the rock following the Israelites through the wilderness (1 Cor. x. 4).

Nor is the similarity between the doxology (vv. 24, 25) and xvi. 25 of the epistle to the Romans, showing the imitation of the latter by the former, inconsistent with the authenticity. But internal phenomena point to a post apostolic time, and therefore to the supposititious character of the epistle. The description of the men who had crept in among the readers suits antinomian Gnostics only. Now Gnosticism proper did not exist in the first century ; for Thiersch's assertions about Christian Gnosticism in the apostolic period are groundless. The false teachers denied the only Lord God and

the Lord Jesus Christ, that is, they made the God of the Old Testament a subordinate being, and rejected the corporeity of Christ. They assumed to be *pneumatic* or spiritual, in opposition to *psychical* or ordinary men—a position which the writer reverses (v. 19). The apostles had formerly predicted the appearance of these ungodly scoffers in the last time, and the prophecy was fulfilled in them. The description of such Gnostic libertines is most unfavourable. They turned the grace of God into lasciviousness, were filthy dreamers, despising angelic dignities; they were murmurers and complainers. The picture is dark, pointing for the most part to conduct rather than belief. They mocked at sacred things, threatening to introduce disorder into the churches by their luxury and wantonness as well as their opposition to existing institutions and partiality for persons. They wallowed in licentiousness. It is strange to us that Christian churches should have been in danger of seduction by such persons; but Christianity did not penetrate into the minds of many.

The portrait of these libertine Gnostics carries us far beyond the lifetime of Jude the brother of James.

Besides, the Greek language was not familiar to a Palestinian Jew, so that a Petrine Christian of the primitive type could not have written the epistle.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

The letter itself throws little light on its exact date. Some put it before the destruction of Jerusalem, chiefly because that catastrophe is not mentioned in verses 5–7. But the argument from silence is a fallacious one; and De Wette is right in saying, that the fact of Jerusalem's destruction being unmentioned, has no bearing on the determination of the date. Renan, apparently believing in the authenticity, supposes that it was written at Jerusalem in A.D. 54 against Paul, because the agents

of James and others who had been sent from Jerusalem had been embittered by his conduct at Antioch. In like manner, Arnaud argues [1] that it preceded the destruction of Jerusalem and is authentic. But the epistle was much later than Jude. The dissertations of Jessien and Arnaud in defence of the authenticity are not successful, though they give all arguments available for the purpose. We learn from Hegesippus, that Jude the Lord's brother was dead in the time of Domitian; and that Simeon son of Cleophas, bishop of Jerusalem, suffered martyrdom under Trajan. Hence Credner infers that the letter was written about A.D. 80. As the author separates himself not merely from the apostles but from their age, in the seventeenth verse, because he says that mockers, foretold by the apostles as about to come in the last time, had already appeared, we must assume a comparatively late date, after all the apostles were dead. It preceded the second epistle of Peter; but how long, it is difficult to say. Hilgenfeld puts it after the epistles of John and before the pastoral ones, on what grounds is not stated. We suppose that it followed the pastorals and was not much later than A.D. 140.

The place of composition is uncertain. Perhaps it was Palestine.

PERSONS TO WHOM IT WAS ADDRESSED; OCCASION AND OBJECT.

Jude calls those to whom he writes, 'sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called,' which means Christians in general. But he must have thought of a definite circle of readers, probably Jewish Christians; because Jewish ideas, if not books, are referred to—traditional notions belonging to Jewish soil.

[1] See Arnaud's *Recherches critiques sur l'épître de Jude*, p. 95, etc.; and Jessien, *De Authentia Epistolæ Judæ commentatio critica*, 1821.

It is impossible to discover their place of abode. If, as it would seem, prosperity and luxury prevailed among them; if riches and attendant vices had an injurious influence on their character, some commercial place is probable, such as Corinth. Syria is more likely, in consequence of Jude's home in Palestine. Mayerhoff advocates Alexandria.

The occasion and object of the epistle are clear. Jude, observing phenomena within the sphere of Christianity inconsistent with apostolic purity, thought it necessary to write to the believers among whom such things existed, warning them against the evil professors to whose influence they were exposed to prevent them from corruption, and to announce the punishment that should certainly overtake the deceivers. The object for which he wrote is stated in the third verse: 'It was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.' As they were in danger of being seduced from that faith, they are exhorted to hold it fast, and to contend for it.

CONTENTS.

The epistle consists of two parts, to which are prefixed an inscription, a salutation, and a short introduction. The first consists of verses 5–19; the second, of 20–23.

After the inscription and salutation in the first two verses, the writer introduces his subject in the third and fourth, telling his readers that he felt it necessary to address them, because certain men had crept in among them, who were described beforehand as doomed to condemnation, godless men who abused the grace of God and denied their only Master, and Jesus Christ (1–4). In relation to these dangerous persons, he instances examples of punishment analogous to that pre-

pared for them, and proceeds to describe their vices. They rejected angelic government, and reviled angelic dignities. How improperly they acted is proved by the case of Michael the archangel, who, disputing with Satan about Moses's body, ventured to say no more than 'The Lord rebuke thee.' In contrast with Michael's conduct, these persons blasphemed angelic existences of whom they were ignorant, while they indulged in sensual gratifications immoderately. The author then threatens them with punishment, according to examples of divine vengeance in the Old Testament, Cain, Balaam, and Korah. They were rocks in the love-feasts of Christians, on which good morals were shipwrecked, because they feasted together fearlessly, taking care of themselves and neglecting the poorer brethren. They are compared to waterless clouds, autumnal trees stripped of their fruits, twice dead, rooted up; wild waves of the sea, foaming out shameful lusts; comets. After quoting Enoch's prophecy respecting them, the description is continued. They are murmurers, discontented with their lot, walking after their own lusts, talking in extravagant strains, fawning upon others for selfish purposes. The apostles prophesied of them as mockers to come in the latter days. The last traits by which they are characterised are the desire to create divisions and parties, and their want of the Holy Spirit (5–19).

Jude addresses an admonition to his readers that they should be established in the holy doctrines of Christianity, that they ought to pray in the Spirit and keep themselves in the love of God, while waiting for His mercy unto eternal life. He also instructs them how they should act towards the persons led away by the parties described. Some they should treat gently, i.e. the doubting and hesitating; others they should pluck out of the fire, hating everything by which they

might be corrupted (20–23). The epistle concludes with a doxology (24, 25).

The diction is full, and harsh, and shows one unable to express his ideas with ease.

Luther's opinion of the epistle was not favourable; he thought it at least an unnecessary production. Schleiermacher and Neander also judged it to be of small value. It is impossible to find in it any distinctive or spiritual doctrine. Yet the conduct which is recommended towards the errorists is charitable. The writer, though hating their practical immorality, does not recommend their excommunication, but tells his hearers to have compassion on some, and to save others with fear, pulling them out of the fire. The concluding doxology is worthy of Paul himself.

THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

ALLEGED AUTHOR.

THE APOSTLE JOHN has been generally considered the writer of the fourth gospel. He was the son of Zebedee, a fisherman belonging to Bethsaida and of Salome, having an older brother James. The parents were in comparatively easy circumstances, as Zebedee is said to have had hired servants with a boat and nets; and Salome ministered to Jesus of her substance. The son followed the father's occupation. His call to be a disciple of Christ is related in Matt. iv. 21, etc.; Mark i. 19, etc,; with which the passage in Luke v. 10 seems to be identical. Peter, James, and John were admitted to special intimacy with Jesus; and the last of the three was distinguished by peculiar marks of his affection. The fourth gospel points to him as the *beloved disciple* or *the disciple whom Jesus loved.* He has been called *one of the breast,*[1] from leaning on the Saviour's bosom at the last supper. John followed his Master into the hall of the high-priest, and was present at the crucifixion if he is the person meant in xix. 35. After the burial, having been informed by Mary Magdalene that the body had been removed, he hastened to the sepulchre. If credit is to be given to John xxi. 2, 3, etc., he returned to his former occupation. After Pentecost he stood before the Sanhedrim with Peter, boldly confessing the name of Jesus. These two

[1] ἐπιστήθιος.

apostles were afterwards sent to Samaria. John was present at the council of Jerusalem, and was one of the Church's pillars there. The time at which he left the metropolis of Judea cannot be ascertained, but it must have been before A.D. 60. Tradition says that he spent the latter part of his life in Asia Minor; and the testimony of Irenæus, a disciple of Polycarp, who was John's follower, confirms it. It is the uniform voice of antiquity that he survived all the apostles. Irenæus says, that he lived till the time of Trajan. It is probable that he died a natural death at Ephesus; for the word *martyr* which Polycrates applies to him, refers to his banishment not his death. As he is supposed to have lived unmarried, he received the epithet *virgin*.[1] According to ancient testimony, he was banished to Patmos. But there is much diversity as to the time of the exile and the Roman emperor under whom he suffered. Irenæus states that he was Domitian; others, Nero, Trajan, Claudius Cæsar. Modern critics have even suspected the truth of the tradition respecting the Patmos-exile; so that Eichhorn thinks it a mere fiction —a local dress which the seer throws round his visions. But we may not reject it, though the patristic accounts of the time vary considerably; and though Origen with Eusebius calls the fact a mere *saying* or *tradition*.[2] It is possible that the story was originally derived from the Apocalypse itself (i. 9).

The uniform tradition of the ancient Church respecting John's ministry and death in Asia, has not been universally accepted. It was first questioned by Vogel, who has been followed by Lützelberger, Keim, Wittichen, Holtzmann, Scholten, and Schenkel. But the old opinion has its defenders in Hilgenfeld and Krenkel, who meet the sceptical arguments successfully.

[1] *παρθένος*, virgo.

[2] *λόγος*, *παράδοσις*.

ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS.

The gospel may be divided into two parts, i.–xii. and xiii.–xxi. These again are resolvable into the following sections: chapter i. which is preliminary; ii.–vi.; vii.–x.; xi., xii.; xiii.–xvii.; xviii.–xx. The last chapter is an appendix.

The prologue (i. 1–18) gives the theme of the whole gospel, which is the conflict between light and darkness, exemplified by the Logos as the principle of life and light, and the world's opposition concentrated in the hostile Jewish party. This conflict terminates in the victory of light, as the Son of God came to save the world by attracting all men to himself. The signification of the word Logos, as used by the evangelist, is that of *the Word*.[1] He was a concrete person before the world existed, not becoming so at the incarnation. As reason becomes speech, so when the eternal reason manifests itself, it is as the Logos; not necessarily hypostatic, but such in the gospel. *When* the Word issued from the divine essence, i.e. *was begotten*, the evangelist forbears to say. Contrary to the opinion of Weiss we hold that the expressions *in the beginning* and *from the beginning* are not used in an absolute sense, and do not imply eternity.[2] The commencement, 'In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God, and the Word was God,' etc., sets forth both the immanent and external existence of the Word as God. This is followed by his demiurgic function, 'All things were made' (became) 'by him,' etc. The writer then speaks of his agency in the created universe: 'What was made was life in him, and the life was the light of men.' He is the principle of life in the outer world, and the intellectual principle in man. John came to testify of the

[1] A personality corresponding to λόγος προφορικός (speech); not to the Platonic *divine reason* (λόγος ἐνδιάθετος).

[2] *Lehrbuch der biblischen Theologie des N. T.* p. 618, 2nd edition.

light of the world who enables men born anew to understand divine things, and became incarnate in the man Jesus. This Word introduced a new dispensation characterised by grace and truth—an absolute religion opposed to Mosaism. The evangelist connects the Logos with Jesus the historical person; the flesh being the investiture or vehicle by which he entered into the relations of earthly existence. The Word *tabernacled* among men. His assumption of our human mode of existence is an episode of his heavenly existence with God, after which he returns to his proper element or original condition. It is important to observe the words employed by the writer. 'The Word became *flesh*,'[1] i.e. the Word entered upon an outer human existence. The expression denoting the act of incarnation does not mean real and abiding manhood, but a subordinate act or accident by which the Logos entered into relation with Jesus. The Logos-person remained the same after the fleshly appearance. A *new person*, a *real man*, neither originated at that time nor in that act. In uniting the only-begotten Son of God with the historical Jesus, the evangelist implies the absence of full humanity. The personality consists essentially of the Logos, the flesh being only a temporary thing. Body, soul, and spirit do not belong to Jesus Christ; he is the Logos incarnate for a time, who soon returns to the original state of oneness with the Father. Such passages as vii. 15; viii. 59; x. 39, especially the first, where the Jews are said to marvel at him as if they did not know him, though they had come in contact with him before in that very place, show no permanent material corporeity. Yet it must be allowed, that the incarnate Logos is also identified with the Jesus of Nazareth who appears and acts in the synoptics. His father, mother, and brethren are mentioned repeatedly, indicating that his personality consists of more than the Logos. He

[1] *σὰρξ ἐγένετο*, which is not an exact equivalent to *ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο*.

manifests himself as a proper man, and calls himself such in chapter viii. 40. The gospel is not consistent in its presentation of his person; for it hovers between a true humanity consisting of soul and body, and a corporeal appearance informed by the Logos. The appellation *Son of God* which is his in a peculiar sense favours the latter; that of *Son of man* agrees best with the former unless it be otherwise limited. The difficulty of reconciling the two aspects cannot be removed, because it is inherent in the nature of the Johannine Christ.

It is observable that the appellation *the Word* does not occur in the speeches of Jesus himself; but that is no argument against its being synonymous with Christ. Had so speculative a term been put into the mouth of Christ, it would have presented a striking contrast to the synoptic account. The phrase *Son of man* is the usual one employed by Christ himself, which the evangelist borrowed from the synoptists; and though scarcely appropriate to his person, its adaptation to such passages as v. 30; xi. 41; xii. 27, etc., is apparent; while the words of iii. 13, 'the Son of man who is in heaven,' identify the pre-existing and post-existing Christ. The Father and the Son are both *God*; but the Father alone is *absolute God*, filling up the whole idea. The Son is *a God* not God absolutely; and does not exhaust the conception.

The testimony of the Baptist (i. 19–51) consists of three particulars belonging to three successive days, and making up together a complete attestation of the person and work of Jesus. The first occurred before the messengers of the Sanhedrim, showing that the Messiah was already present though generally unknown, and asserting his absolute pre-existence. The second went farther, stating that Jesus is the Messiah, the Redeemer of the world through suffering and death. The third showed him as the atoning Lamb to two

disciples, who were the means of bringing him into contact with the faith of the world. The world must believe in the Messiah whom the Baptist first attested. After Andrew, Simon, and John attached themselves to Christ, others became his disciples. It is observable that Andrew was convinced of the Messiahship of Jesus after abiding with the latter for a single night, whereas the synoptists make Peter to be the first in announcing it, and that long after Andrew's utterance of the belief.

The 2nd chapter gives an account of Jesus's first miracle, which takes place at Cana in Galilee, not at Bethany. This opening act of his ministry manifests his glory and dignity. The miracle has a symbolical import, and is probably connected with the superiority of the new religion to the old. The element of the latter was water, ceremonial purity; in the metamorphosis of water into wine, Messianic agency displaces the inferior baptism. After spending a few days at Capernaum, Jesus goes to a passover at Jerusalem, where he purges the temple of buyers and sellers. The scene of his ministry, according to this gospel, is Judea not Galilee; and therefore he appears from the commencement in the prophetic metropolis, the centre of Jewish unbelief, that the object of his manifestation might be put at once in the way of accomplishment. The act of cleansing the temple is transferred from the end to the beginning of Christ's ministry. On the same occasion the evangelist makes him allude to his future death and resurrection.

The 3rd chapter narrates Christ's conversation with Nicodemus a ruler of the Jews, whose faith resting on miracles is not essentially different from unbelief, in the evangelist's view. Even in his faith he is the representative of unbelieving Judaism. The necessity of regeneration is inculcated in the course of the interview. A new birth is required of him who would see the kingdom of God, and in producing the change two

factors co-operate; baptism and the spirit. Genuine faith rests on the Son of God the Light of the world, not on outward signs; and the true man comes to the light, as his deeds are performed in communion with God (iii. 1–21). The conversation is symbolical of intellectual unbelief. It is succeeded by another testimony on the part of John to Christ, called forth by the former's baptising (22–36).

On his way to Galilee through Samaria, Christ meets and talks with a Samaritan woman at Jacob's well, near Sychar. The woman and the narrative are symbolical. She is the representative of heathenism, with its susceptibility of faith in Jesus. Accordingly many Samaritans are said to believe, not merely because of her words but because they heard Christ themselves and knew that the Saviour of the world appeared before them. The conversion of the heathen generally is shadowed forth by the fields already white to harvest. Nicodemus appears as the representative of Jewish unbelief, or of an external faith based upon outward signs, a mere intellectual belief, which cannot introduce the subject of it into the spiritual kingdom of God. The Samaritans, with their predisposition to salvation, represent a true though imperfect faith. Nicodemus still remains in Judaism; the Samaritans pass over into Christianity. Thus the beautiful narrative symbolises the gospel's passing over to the Gentiles (iv. 1–42), whose spiritual aptitude for salvation, in contrast with the blindness of the Jews, enters into the plan of the gospel.

We have next the second miracle performed by Jesus, the cure of the ruler's son at Capernaum, which we suppose to be identical with that related in Matt. viii. 5, etc.; Luke vii. 1, etc., notwithstanding the divergences observable in the three accounts. Here the peculiarity of the miracle is, that Christ heals the sick person while he is remote; for the one is at Capernaum, the other in

Galilee; and that by a word. The evangelist's object is to show the nature of true faith, viz. that one must believe before seeing a miracle and without one. A miracle is wrought by the simple word of the doer upon an individual at a distance, indicating the necessity of believing the word of the doer that the thing has taken place, or before it is seen. The ruler believes at once. Thus we are taught again, that Christ should be believed *because of his word* as the Samaritans believed, and not on account of signs and wonders. The faith wrought by the sight of miracles is an external thing censured by the Redeemer; whereas the faith that receives his word is commended. The greatness of the miracle in the present instance derives all its significance, in the evangelist's view, from the declaration *thy son liveth*, which the nobleman accepted at once, without ocular demonstration of the fulfilment (iv. 43–54).

The 5th chapter relates the cure of a sick man at the pool of Bethesda, and the words of Jesus suggested by it. The Jews found fault with a deed performed on the sabbath-day. Here that practical unbelief which does not see divinity in the miracles of Christ, but denies their divine character altogether, is set forth. God never rests, continuing his agency unceasingly; so does the Son; and miracles are but acts of that ever-working power. The Jews, in disbelieving the Son, showed unbelief in the Father also, and evinced their total incapacity to apprehend 'divine revelation,' by their anxiety for human applause. Their practical unbelief culminated in their seeking to kill Jesus for works in which God himself testified to the character of the person by whom they were wrought. Thus the Word is presented in conflict with Jewish unbelief.

The 6th chapter commences with an account of Jesus miraculously feeding five thousand, followed by his walking on the sea of Galilee. The former serves merely to introduce the discourse that took place in the synagogue

at Capernaum. Here the idea of the Logos as the absolute principle of life is unfolded in the Messianic agency of Jesus. All spiritual life is nourished and maintained by him. He is the bread of life, the heavenly manna that came down from heaven to give life to men. As bread must be eaten to support physical life, so the incarnate Word must be received into the spirit, and unite with it in substantial unity. True faith is set forth in the sensuous form of eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of God; unbelief is represented by materialistic eating and drinking, apart from every spiritual ingredient.

The 7th chapter is the commencement of a new section, which ends with the 10th. The combat of Jesus with the unbelief of the world proceeds in different stages; the Jews being the representatives of that unbelief. He goes up to the feast of tabernacles, appears in the temple, teaches there, justifies acts of healing on the sabbath, and meets the doubts entertained by the people of his Messianic dignity. The Pharisees are angry that their officers did not apprehend him, and reprove Nicodemus for taking his part. It has been observed by Baur, that the chapter contains three different acts of Jesus's self-development. In the first, he appears in secret; in the second, he speaks openly, declaring that the Jews knew him and whence he came; in the third, he says that the Messianic Spirit dwelt in him absolutely, and that streams of living water flowed from those who believed in his name. Thus the divine greatness of Jesus is inculcated. In opposition to such irresistible evidence of his character, the logic of unbelief can only present the nugatory argument that he could not be the Messiah because he was of Galilee, whereas the Messiah must be of David's seed and of David's town, Bethlehem.

The story of the woman taken in adultery with which the 8th chapter begins, may or may not be historical.

But its leading idea is in harmony with the surrounding context. The more one is conscious of his sins and recognises the need of forgiveness, the more disposed is he to admit that others also require forgiveness, and will therefore hesitate to become their accuser. In this manner Jesus meets the charge of the Pharisees against him, that he associated with publicans and sinners (viii. 1–11). Succeeding discourses of Christ in conflict with Jewish unbelief present him as the Light of the world, who came forth from the Father and returns to Him—a testimony about himself which is valid even according to the Mosaic law, because it is borne by two witnesses. But how can those accept the testimony of the Father who do not know Him? And such as know not God are not *His* children, but the children of the devil. The unbelieving Jews are therefore children of the father of lies. They call Abraham their father; a vain assumption, because one who rejoiced in the day of Jesus's Messianic manifestation, cannot acknowledge them as his children (12–59).

The 9th chapter gives an account of a blind man restored to sight, a miracle in which the Word appears as the principle of light, showing forth his light-giving, as he had already shown his life-giving, power in restoring the ruler's son to health. Jewish unbelief presents itself in opposition to this miracle by fixing on the mere external circumstance that the sabbath was profaned. The last three verses of the chapter give the scope of the narrative. When Jesus, as the Light of the world, reveals the works of God, the blind see, and the seeing become blind. In other words, those who wish to see the divinity of Jesus will acknowledge it; such as do not wish, are given over to blindness. Unbelief, which is the blindness of seeing, is self-judged.

The 10th chapter carries on the leading idea of the 9th, viz. that Jesus is the Light of the world; so that the persons who follow him walk securely. As leader

of the faithful, he is like a good shepherd, standing in intimate relation to his sheep and even laying down his life for them, if necessary. The Pharisees, on the contrary, the heads of the Jewish people, are hireling shepherds, thieves and robbers who forsake the flock in times of danger (1–21). After this, Jesus appears at the feast of dedication in the temple, when the Jews crowd about him, earnestly seeking a plain declaration as to his personality. Here he states his oneness with the Father, at which they are greatly incensed. If they would not believe his word, he refers them to his works, whose divine character is so apparent as to make their unbelief inexcusable. This closes his dialectic combat with the Jews; for it is said that he went away to the place beyond Jordan where John baptized at first, and abode there (22–42).

The 11th chapter narrates the raising of Lazarus from the grave, a miracle the most stupendous of the series described in the gospel. Jesus had already shown his divine glory by what he did—he had already worked the works of God in curing the nobleman's son at a distance, and healing one born blind—he had manifested the rays of that glory which streamed forth from his person in acts of divine power—he had reduced unbelief to its proper root, perversity of will; now he exhibits the culminating act of his divinity by raising the dead. This miracle is the crisis of his earthly course, being the immediate occasion of that catastrophe which terminated in his death. Like his other miracles, it is typical. A leading idea lies at the basis, shaping its form and circumstances; which can be no other than the great sentiment expressed in the twenty-fifth verse: 'I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he die, yet shall he live.' The whole is symbolical of that consciousness of an undying life which true faith calls into lively exercise. It is also likely that the resurrection of Lazarus was intended

to foreshadow Jesus's own resurrection. This final and greatest manifestation of the Messiah's glory led directly to the practical result in which unbelieving opposition to his person reached its consummation—his crucifixion. Caiaphas the high-priest represents the final stage of that unbelief, when he said that it was better that Jesus should be put to death, whether he were guilty or not, than that the whole nation should be destroyed through the displeasure of the Romans.

It has been thought strange, that this miracle, the greatest of all in itself and its consequences, should be unnoticed by the synoptists. Had they known it, it is difficult to account for their silence; and had it been a historical fact, it is as difficult to account for their ignorance. No reference to the incident occurs at the trial and condemnation of Jesus. The Jews do not speak of it. Pilate had not heard of it, the disciples are silent about it. Had it occurred so soon before, it could hardly have been ignored so utterly; especially as many of the Jews saw and believed; while some went directly from Bethany to the Pharisees in Jerusalem and told what Jesus did. The region to which the synoptists confine their descriptions does not explain their silence respecting the miracle. It is true that they give the Galilean, not the Judean ministry; but they bring Jesus in the end to Jerusalem, so that the metropolis is not excluded entirely from their range of vision. As it was the immediate cause of the final catastrophe, and heralded in type the resurrection of the Prince of life, it was too important to be omitted by the other evangelists, had it been a real occurrence. The unusual display of power in it suits the general purpose of the gospel. It is the acme of miracle, which calls forth the intensest enmity of the Pharisees, hastening the fate of the innocent One, and with it his return to glory. The writer has converted the Lazarus of the parable in Luke (xvi.) into a historical person.

Three circumstances have been singled out to indicate its unhistorical character: the prayer of Jesus, which is a mere accommodation one, offered up for the sake of others (verse 42); the tears shed for the dead, amid the conscious certainty of his immediate re-animation (35); and the statement that the sickness was not unto death (4) but for the revelation of the divine glory. The solution of the difficulty is bound up with the credibility of miracles.

The next chapter relates the anointing of Jesus at Bethany prior to his solemn entry into Jerusalem, with the triumphal entrance itself (1–19). Some Greeks visited the metropolis, desirous to see him. It is not stated, whether they obtained their request; nor are the circumstances of the interview specified. Indeed the three verses (xii. 20–22) stand isolated, having little relation to what follows or precedes. Hence the word *them* of the twenty-third verse is vaguely used. He speaks of his death and glorification, requires the steadfast adherence of his followers, and is above the fear of death. The mention of Gentiles points to the fact that the Church of the faithful was to proceed from believing heathenism, of which these stranger Greeks are the representatives. The result of the evangelical history is then summed up in the statement, that though Jesus had done so many miracles before the Jews they did not believe. Yet their unbelief does not detract from his divine agency. He is still the Light of the world, in and by whom the Father works—the medium of every communication between God and man (xii.).

The next section embraces chapters xiii–xvi., and contains Jesus's discourses to his disciples. His dialectic conflict with the Jews is finished; the only result of it being their determined unbelief. Must the world then continue to oppose the Redeemer? Is it to remain unbelieving, and so far frustrate his work? That must not be. The disciples are the instruments of the world's

conversion. Through them mankind are to be conducted from unbelief to faith. Here therefore they come into significance as an element in developing the Messianic agency. But they themselves must first be tried, purified, and elevated to a full consciousness of their union with the Word, so that they may stand in the same relation to him as he does to the Father.

The 13th chapter begins with an account of Jesus washing the disciples' feet, an act of condescending love, teaching humility. He then indicates his betrayal by Judas, his death, and Peter's denial. In the 14th he comforts them with the hope of reunion with himself in the immediate presence of God, assuring them that they should not be left orphans in the world, but have the indwelling presence of the Paraclete and be taught all things. The 15th chapter continues the series of discourses, by setting forth the union between Christ and his disciples under the similitude of a vine and its branches, and exhorting them to be steadfast in love to him though they should be hated and persecuted by an unbelieving world; for the Paraclete would unite with them in testifying of the glorified Messiah. The subject of the 16th is substantially the same as that of the preceding. It contains a more definite prediction of future persecutions, and a description of the agency of the Spirit both in relation to the unbelieving world and the disciples. Announcing his death, he tells them that they should see him again, and have their sorrow turned into joy. The disciples profess their conviction of his divine origin and mission. With the prediction of their forsaking him in the hour of danger, he expresses his confidence in God, and a consciousness of victory.

The 17th chapter, containing the final prayer of Jesus, expresses the sublimest and purest utterances of a spirit in intimate union with God. The consciousness of the divine in the man Jesus is reflected here in

a very high form. The prayer sets forth the glorification of the Son in consequence of the completion of his work, and an intercession with the Father for the disciples that they may be kept in the faith. Nor is it limited to the few followers then present, but is extended to all believers, that they may be taken into union with the Father and the Son.

The leading idea of the 14th, 15th, 16th, and 17th chapters is the glorification of the Son by the Father, and the consequent glorification of the Father by the Son. The glorification of the Son by the Father consists in constituting him the giver of everlasting life to humanity; and the glorification of the Father by the Son is the giving of that life to mankind. The object for which Jesus was sent into the world is accomplished when a true consciousness of the divine is communicated to humanity; when men are brought to feel that there is within them a divine principle or spirit uniting them to God.

The last three chapters (xviii., xix., xx.) treat of the passion, death, and resurrection of Jesus, in which the external course of the Son's glorification is depicted. The 18th begins with his capture in Gethsemane, after which come his accusation before the high-priest, Peter's denial, and Jesus's trial before the Roman procurator who wishes to set him free but has not the courage to risk the Jews' displeasure. Accordingly having scourged, he commanded him to be delivered up, with the design of obviating further proceedings against the accused, and hoping that the Jews would be satisfied with the lesser punishment. But they persisted in their demand for his crucifixion; and prevailed over the timid, well-meaning Pilate (xviii., xix. 1–16). According to Luke, Pilate's proposal to scourge Jesus by way of compromise, was not carried into effect, because the Jews insisted on crucifixion; but the fourth evangelist, who takes a more favourable view of

heathens than the synoptists, and therefore places the Roman procurator in a better light, represents the scourging as actually happening. The scourging in Matt. xxvii. 26, is different, since it came after the judicial sentence, according to the legal course. It was unusual to scourge a criminal before he was condemned to death. The crucifixion itself, its attendant circumstances, the taking of the body from the cross and its interment, are next related (xix. 17–42). The piercing of Jesus's side, the issuing from it of water and blood, the fulfilment of old Testament predictions, and especially the exclamation 'it is finished,' belong to the main scope of the work, and shows its tendency very clearly. The emphasis attached to them is characteristic of the writer's design rather than of his presence as a spectator.

The last chapter of the gospel (xx.) contains an account of the resurrection. Two apostles find the grave empty; and Jesus appears first to Mary, to whom he said, 'Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father, but go to my brethren and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God.' He would not be delayed in the act of his ascension, which the evangelist conceives of as following immediately upon the resurrection. The day of the resurrection is that of the ascension. Both are parts of one act.[1] The disciples, therefore, received the Holy Ghost on the day of the resurrection, according to promise. But a second appearance of the Lord to Thomas is related. Why is this? To show that the faith which rests on the outward is only a step to that higher faith which believes without seeing. Thomas's scepticism is overcome and he attains to faith; but blessed are they who believe without tangible evidence.

The nature of the body which the evangelist assigns to the risen Jesus and his conception of the ascension

[1] The present tense *ἀναβαίνω* is significant.

are difficult points of inquiry. His general christology would lead to a docetic view of the risen body. The Word assumed a light envelope, which he laid aside in returning to the Father. He did not appear in a gross, material form, but in a state exempt from the usual conditions of matter, though visible. In fact, the risen one was no longer an inhabitant of earth. Floating about as a being already glorified, he appeared to Mary Magdalene as well as the assembled disciples. It was from Heaven that he showed himself to his followers and to Thomas, on which occasions he had not an earthly body. The evangelist thought of an envelope sufficient to mark personal identity. The main thing in his view was the continuance of life after death.

Luke's representation that he ate and drank with the apostles after the resurrection (Acts x. 41), and showed himself to them with a body of flesh and bones (Luke xxiv. 39, 40), is inconsistent with the genius of our gospel.

The 21st chapter, which is an appendix, describes another appearance of Jesus, a miraculous draught of fishes, the meal he partook of with the disciples, and the conversation with Peter, who is rebuked for his curiosity respecting John. The tenor of this addition is out of harmony with the character of the gospel, and of the 20th chapter in particular. Instead of the Word hastening to ascend to heaven, we have here a delay on earth. The paragraph re-opens a gospel which had concluded with the 20th chapter; and resembles the synoptic manner rather than that of the fourth gospel. It is obviously inconsistent with the words of Christ to Mary Magdalene.

The accounts of the resurrection in the other gospels do not clear up the corresponding one in the fourth, but are contradictory to it; and the attempts to weave them all into a consistent narrative are vain. The women learn that the tomb is empty sometimes

through two angels or young men, sometimes through one ; these angels are inside the tomb, and again they are outside. Such discrepancies may perhaps be explained by the amazement of the women finding the tomb empty. But it is not so easy to understand how the Marys, after ascertaining that the tomb was empty, returned immediately (Matt. xxviii. 8 ; Luke xxiv. 11 ; Mark xvi. 8); while according to Mark xvi. 9, and John xx. 11, Mary Magdalene continued at the grave and saw Jesus there. The notices of *the place* in which the risen one appeared, and the duration of his restored life on earth, are still more puzzling. The first appearances are put into Galilee by Matthew xxviii. 7, 16 ; Mark xvi. 7 ; and John xxi.; the other accounts locate them in Jerusalem and its neighbourhood ; for it is only in the latter place that the ascension described by Mark and Luke as happening on the resurrection day is intelligible ; a fact that excludes Galilee. But as the narratives in John xx. give Jerusalem, and those in xxi. Galilee, we might have recourse to the forty days of the Acts, which allow time for the appearances in places far apart, though they exclude the supposititious statement of Mark and Luke respecting the ascension on the resurrection day. If a hiatus be assumed between the 49 and 50 verses of Luke xxiv. ; and if Mark xvi. 9–20 be rejected as spurious, we might say that though Jesus referred the disciples to Galilee, he continued for a little while in Jerusalem, went thence to Galilee, and returned to the metropolis, from which he ascended at the end of forty days. These are violent remedies for reconciling the conflicting statements of the writers ; neither do they harmonise all the particulars.[1]

Apart from philosophical considerations, it is not easy to perceive a providential purpose in raising up the very body which had been laid in the tomb, as if the living spirit, when out of the body and in heaven, were not *the*

[1] See Bellermann's *Zum Frieden in und mit der Kirche*, p. 56, etc.

person. Was the structure of flesh and blood existing at death essential to personal identity in heaven? True, a stupendous miracle may have been wrought on that singular occasion; but miracles should not be hastily assumed. The absence of clear testimony, the incongruity of the gospel narratives, the body of flesh and blood presupposed in some passages (Matthew xxviii. 9), compared with the ethereal body implied in others (Luke xxiv. 16, 31; John xx. 17), throw doubt over the whole. Even if the narratives record a miracle, they consist of incongruous materials that offend credibility. According to Mark xvi. 9, Jesus appeared first to Mary Magdalene, with which John xx. agrees; but in Matthew xxviii. he appeared to her and the other Mary at the same time; while in Luke xxiv. the first manifestation is to Peter.

We admit the existence of serious objections to the opinion that Jesus was not seen *bodily* on earth after he had been put to death. How did the belief that he actually appeared to different persons and in different places originate, if it was incorrect? Can the excited imagination of the women who professed to see him, and spread the report among his disciples, account for the fact? Certainly Mary Magdalene had a peculiar temperament; for she had been dispossessed of seven devils. If not epileptic, she was easily carried away by strong feelings acted upon by a highly nervous organisation. Can the fact be resolved into the bewilderment of the Marys, especially as they did not expect his resurrection? We know that the subjective may turn into the objective; but did it in this instance? If we consider that the appearance of Jesus to Paul on his journey to Damascus was an *inner* revelation, as the apostle himself states (Galat. i. 16); and that he puts it in the same category with all other appearances, including those in the gospels, we are led to assign the character of inward visions to all the manifestations of

Christ after his death, to whomsoever they were made.

The difficulties against the physical re-animation of the crucified one overbalance those on the other side, and can only be resolved by assuming a miracle. But why should that miracle include a great earthquake, the descent of angels from heaven, their sitting inside the sepulchre or on the stone that stopped its mouth, their speaking to the visitants of the tomb, and telling them where to look for the risen one ?

As to miracles, they must be viewed in the light of psychology. They are phenomena of the religious consciousness rather than of nature, and rest on a dualistic conception. Those who take an external view of revelation cannot find God in the natural order of events or in the moral acts of man ; and look for Him in supernatural things which interrupt the course of nature and the connection of history. But the immanence of Deity is lost sight of when the phenomena of nature are transcended in order to find wonders which He works directly. A theoretical distinction is created between the natural and the supernatural by the religious consciousness expatiating beyond universal experience and tending to dualism accordingly. Uniform experience and the constant presence of God in the succession of all creatures and all events throw the idea of miracle into the background. It must also be said, that miracles are not an essential part of real Christianity. They are outside its everlasting truths. The words of Christ alone are eternal ; and it is they, not miracles that form the indestructible basis on which our religion rests. They are its true essence and cannot be impaired, though belief in the arbitrary suspension of nature's order pass away.

No hypothesis like that of Schleiermacher and an anonymous writer [1] is at all probable. The idea of sus-

[1] *The Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, as given by the four Evangelists, critically examined.* London, 1865.

pended animation, not real death, is involved in insuperable difficulty.

We conclude that the evidence for the historical resurrection stated by the evangelist breaks down. But this does not prevent our belief in the fact understood in a different way from that in which it is recorded. According to Bishop Butler, death is not the destruction of living agents; so that the loss of the present body does not change conscious personality. The moment of death is the moment of rising from the dead. Hence it is correct to say that Jesus rose from the dead. In the true sense of the expression, 'He is risen.'

The resurrection was followed by the *ascension*, and this also has varieties of narration. It is not in the synoptic gospels themselves; for Mark xvi. 19 and the words in Luke xxiv. 'he was carried up into heaven' are additions which put it on the day of the resurrection, as does the epistle of Barnabas.[1] The tradition respecting the ascension fluctuated at the beginning of the second century. The author of the *Ascension of Isaiah* as well as the Valentinians supposed that Christ returned to the Father after eighteen months; an opinion not thought heretical when the gospels were written. The original view took the resurrection and ascension to be coincident; their subsequent separation giving rise to diversities. In the Acts of the Apostles forty days are put for the first time between the two; and that supplanted prior opinions.

LEADING CHARACTERISTICS.

(*a.*) The teaching of the gospel was influenced by the philosophy of the day. The Jews of Alexandria had their gnosis, a product of Jewish ideas united with the speculative philosophy of the Greeks, especially that of Plato. Of such Jewish-Alexandrian gnosis Philo is

[1] Epist. xv. 9.

the best representative; and his views throw light on the fourth gospel. We cannot indeed show that the evangelist was acquainted with his writings, or that he derived his leading ideas from him directly; but it is clear that the modes of thought as well as the very expressions which characterise the Philonian writings, had an important bearing on the conceptions of the writer. If they did not create, they at least extended, his intellectual atmosphere. The general thinking of the age in which he lived was moulded by Philo. In the Alexandrian philosophy, the term Logos is an important one; but it is difficult to ascertain the exact meaning attached to it by Philo; for while in some parts of his works the Logos appears as a faculty or attribute—God in the aspect of his activity—it is spoken of in others as an hypostasis or person. The Alexandrian theologian presents an idea of the Logos hovering between the personal and impersonal, between a being with God and God's eternal thought or wisdom; but with a decided inclination to the former, which Dorner's one-sided representation, with all its antagonism to Gfrörer, cannot efface. The Logos-conception was necessary to his philosophy, because the Supreme God cannot enter into direct personal relation with the finite. God as an *actual* Being, in distinction from what He is in himself *absolutely*, requires the Logos-idea. There is certainly more in Philo to countenance the opinion that he thought of the Logos as a being, than as a property of God. He is the mediator, the instrument by whom God formed the world. He is neither unbegotten like God, nor begotten after the manner of men. He is an image and shadow of God, a second God.[1] He is the representative and ambassador of God, the interpreter of his will, the angel or archangel who is the medium of the revelations and operations of God, the high-priest who introduces supplications, his firstborn. Here the path is fully

[1] Θεός is applied to him without the article.

opened to a distinction in the godhead. Though his Logos-doctrine be indefinite, it furnishes God's manifestation of Himself. The theory of the Logos, according to the fourth gospel, is in harmony with the Philonian. He was *in the beginning*, or before the visible world existed, being already with God. He was the only-begotten of the Father, the perfect expression of the essence of God, the Son of God in a peculiar sense. The world [1] originated by him. It is not said that he *created* it, but the same verb [2] is used by the evangelist and Philo, implying that the Logos gave matter the form it has in the visible world. Matter became the Cosmos by means of the Logos. The fourth gospel, however, has an important advance upon Philo's doctrine, when it announces the incarnation of the Logos in Jesus. In this respect the author expresses an idea foreign to the Alexandrian philosophy. Though the Logos is sometimes hypostatised in Philo, his incarnation is alien to that writer. The Word, the Son of God, was manifested personally in the flesh. Whence this element was derived, we cannot tell. Did it exist before it was incorporated in the gospel ? Was it the result of philosophical reflection subsequent to Philo ? Did Hellenic culture excogitate it ? Or did the writer himself draw it from the depths of his consciousness ? These are questions we cannot answer, and therefore an important link between Philonism and the Logos-theory of the fourth gospel is missing. Up to a certain point it is easy to bring the Logos-doctrine of John into harmony with the philosophical ideas of Philo, a harmony not accidental because it includes *terms* as well as thoughts ; but when it is announced that *the Logos became flesh*, the coincidence ceases. Jewish-Alexandrian theosophy had penetrated into Asia Minor, where it came in contact with a Hellenic culture somewhat different perhaps from that with which it amalgamated

[1] ὁ κόσμος. [2] γίνομαι.

in Egypt: whether the effect of its modification there was to evolve the new conception, we are unable to tell. Perhaps the later Paulinism, especially the epistle to the Colossians, contributed to it along with Gnostic speculations which threatened to subvert Christianity unless confronted by a doctrine conserving the human as well as the divine in the person of the founder. The epistle to the Hebrews also, which bears upon its face an Alexandrian stamp, may have helped the unknown author to the idea of the Logos-incarnation in Jesus. With Philo's almost hypostatising of the Logos, the Pauline pre-existence of Christ, the Son's designation in the epistle to the Hebrews as an effulgence of the Father's glory and express image of his substance, with the masculine gender of the term Logos itself, the way was open to the doctrine of the incarnation.

It is argued by Tholuck, Weiss, and others, that the Logos-doctrine of this gospel was of Palestinian origin, being derived from the Old Testament which speaks of the *Word of Jehovah*, and from the *Wisdom* of the Proverbs with the apocryphal books Sirach and Wisdom. More to the purpose is the *Memra* of the Targums, the Word of Jehovah, which is used in a personal sense. But the doctrine of the Memra in the Chaldee paraphrases is later than the Logos-doctrine of Alexandria. The oldest of the Targums cannot be dated in the first century, nor even in the second, in its present state. Besides, Alexandrian gnosis probably influenced the Palestinian theology, as Gfrörer has shown.[1] If it did not, it was at least diffused in Asia Minor at the close of the first century.

The conception of the Logos, who is the Son of God in a metaphysical sense, forms the key-note of the gospel. The prologue propounds it as the starting-point; and though the word does not occur again, the idea pervades the remaining portion. The particulars

[1] *Philo und die alexandrinische Theosophie*, zweiter Theil, 1831.

it includes are unfolded in discourses and events, which are selected to show the Word in his personal relations to the world. The exclusion of many things found in the synoptics—the manner in which the life of Jesus is presented—what he says and what he does not say—are regulated by this fundamental idea, and logically derived from it. The connection of every part with the sentiments of the prologue, according as the metaphysical idealism is carried out in detail, is perceptible. The gospel is speculative, simply because it develops the conceptions enunciated at the outset. It is more spiritual than the synoptics because it speaks of the agency of the Word through his incarnation in Jesus.

Akin to the Logos is the Paraclete, a characteristic word in the Johannine writings, expressing a peculiar doctrinal conception. Like the *logos*, it belongs to Alexandrian philosophy, and occurs in Philo. An approach to the same idea appears in the epistle to the Hebrews, where the high-priesthood of Christ and his perpetual intercession are said to be exercised in heaven. As Philo represents the Logos mediating between God and the world, even as *a suppliant*[1] on behalf of helpless mortals, the fourth gospel ascribes the Paraclete to the incarnate Logos, who after his return to the Father, sends him as his representative to the orphan disciples. The range of ideas to which the term belongs was developed later than the time of Jesus, or even of the last apostle. Alexandrian philosophy, as seen in Philo's writings, may have furnished the word; but the associations of it are later than the first century.

In conformity with the doctrine of the incarnate Logos everything is avoided that would favour the idea of Christ's development in knowledge and virtue. He is perfect at first; and all that implies growth is carefully kept out of sight. The traditions that represent him as a descendant of David, the genealogies, his birth

[1] ἱκέτης. *Quis rerum divinarum hæres*, p. 501, vol. i. ed. Mangey.

at Bethlehem, the adoration of the infant by the Eastern Magi as King of the Jews, and the miraculous conception, are absent. The fact that Jesus was baptized by John his inferior, is also omitted. The incarnate Word cannot be exposed to the temptations recorded in the synoptics ; nor does he need a heavenly voice to attest his Sonship. His knowledge is all-embracing. He reads the hearts of men and knows the future. He requires no message to inform him that Lazarus is ill ; and announces his death to the disciples. The account of his passion is also adapted to show that the Word made flesh was the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world. The prince of this world has no hold upon him. He does not pray, 'Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me,' but says 'The cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it ?' He would not pray, 'Father, save me from this hour,' since he had come for that hour. He knows the traitor from the beginning, and proceeds to the place where he is about to come, to show obedience to the Father. His enemies fall to the ground when he says, 'I am he ;' and he dies uttering the triumphant cry, 'It is finished.' He does not partake of the paschal supper, because he was himself the true passover. Not a bone of him is broken ; and from his pierced side flow water and blood that purify and quicken. Before Pilate, the synoptical King of the Jews is transformed into a sovereign whose kingdom is truth. Simon of Cyrene does not appear, because exhaustion or faintness would be derogatory. 'Eli, Eli, lama Sabacthani,' is also eliminated. No external prodigy enhances the grandeur of his death. No earthquake, no rending of rocks or of the temple-vail occurs. His body is laid in the tomb by two men of distinction, and embalmed at great cost, contrary to the synoptical account. After his resurrection, he presents himself without previous notice to Mary Magdalene and then to the ten. Angels do not announce him to the

disciples. And it is necessary that one of the eleven should be absent, to become the type of a sensuous faith.

In harmony with these characteristics, the evangelist does not narrate the institution of the Lord's supper, because he is concerned with ideas more than formal acts. The essence of the supper, communion with Christ, having been already inculcated, the writer, consistently with his doctrinal standpoint, ignores its historical institution. Mr. Tayler, supposing that the 6th chapter contains the doctrine of the Lord's Supper as it existed in its developed state in the middle of the second century, converts it into an argument for the late origin of the gospel.[1]

These observations show that the production was not meant for history. It was composed in another interest, as is evident from the doctrinal statement at the beginning. Speculative considerations are paramount. There is no human development, no growth of incidents or course of life. The transactions are in the realm of thought. The Word enshrined in his earthly tabernacle flashes out splendour on the people, presenting the eternal and all-embracing light which is to purify the world.

The work cannot be called a poem, because it is too metaphysical and doctrinal. Connected with the inner life it is Gnostic to a certain extent. The essence of Christianity is placed in living union with the divine person whose wondrous nature is exhibited. It is not a biography or book of instruction. Though it stirs the emotional part of our nature and nurtures aspirations allied to the Infinite, it is speculative and spiritual; a Gnostic gospel, in which Alexandrian philosophy and Hellenic culture combine to set forth Christ in his mysterious relation to the Father and to believers, as well as the influence of his teachings in raising humanity to its highest ideal.

[1] *An Attempt to ascertain the character of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 95, 96.

The character of the miracles in the gospel is in accordance with what has been stated. The impotent man had been thirty years in that state; the blind man had been so born; and Lazarus had been dead four days, so that his body had become putrid. The nobleman's son is healed at a distance. The incarnate Word shows his omnipotence in changing water into wine. He walks on the sea of Galilee, and is not taken into the boat, as the synoptists represent him to be. His glory is always being manifested, nor does he cease to be a visible image of the Father. He does not empty himself by a voluntary demission of his glory, but reveals the fulness of his perfection even in the flesh. This differs from Paul's representation. That it is very unlike the synoptics is obvious, since they imply development; though it is impossible to trace that development step by step, as Schenkel has tried to do. Jesus himself, in Mark, admits his ignorance on one subject, the day and hour of the destruction of Jerusalem; and Luke says that he 'increased in knowledge.' But when did Jesus first attain to a definite idea of the universality of his kingdom? He appeared as the Jewish Messiah immediately after his contact with, and baptism by, John. The gospel-records, with their vague chronology, are silent about the development. The mode and time of his mental transition from Jewish particularism to a universalist view cannot be fixed. The conduct of the Jews, and especially the faith of the Syro-phenician woman, seem to have developed the idea that the Gentiles as well as the Jews should be included in his kingdom. This is substantially the view of Schenkel and Keim,[1] which is more natural than Albaric's, who puts the real history of his development prior to his public ministry, as soon as he had an ideal conception of the Messianic kingdom; and explains the later appearance of universalism by the

[1] *Der geschichtliche Christus*, p. 51, etc., 3rd ed.

supposition that he confined his ministry to Israel for a while, from wise reasons connected with time and space.[1] In like manner, the belief that he must die did not enter into the original plan of his mission ; for even on the evening of his betrayal he had not wholly abandoned the idea that the cup might pass from him. A suffering Messiah was a posterior phase of the original Messiah-conception ; just as the universality of his kingdom was a later phase of belief. So too *sonship*, as an element of Messiahship, grew and deepened with time. This human development of Jesus—the evolution of his self-consciousness—has been overshadowed by his divine life ; and men have dwelt upon the latter as the fourth gospel teaches it ; but the historian cannot be insensible to that aspect of his person which brings him nearer ourselves, and makes him the object of universal faith. If the Alexandrian philosophy of the fourth gospel has presented an ideal rather than a historical Christ, other bearings of the subject must be looked at.

(*b.*) The fourth gospel presents an original dualism which accords with Alexandrian speculation. Instead of saying that God *created* the world, a kingdom of darkness exists from the beginning under the dominion of the prince of this world. This being is hostile to God ; he is the devil, Satan, the evil one. Because of his essential opposition to God, he is connected with matter. There are two classes of men, the children of God, and the children of the devil. The latter are inspired by Satan, as Judas was. It is for this reason that Jesus does not pray for the world, which is incapable of conversion, but for his disciples ; and that the Son does not quicken all men, but those whom he wills, such as are able to hear his word. The exclusion of the world is very different from the spirit of him who prayed for his enemies, as described in the synoptics (Luke xxiii. 34, comp. Matthew v. 44). The Jews

[1] *Revue de Théologie*, 1865, pp. 148, 149.

could not hear his word, because they were children of the devil (viii. 43, 44). Darkness is opposed to light, or in other words to the Logos, the medium of the world's organisation. All sin is the work of the devil; it is a principle directly hostile to the Being who is essentially good. God, who is light and love, has nothing but a holy aversion to it, and does not use it in the execution of his purposes. When the gospel states that the union of Christ and his disciples will bring about the result of the world's *believing* that God sent his Son (xvii. 21), it is not true faith which is referred to, but the conviction produced by irresistible evidence, an involuntary homage rendered to the force of proof. Not till the prince of the world is expelled from his kingdom, as the result of Christ's death, shall all men be drawn into faith and fellowship with the Word.

The contrasts in the gospel are striking. Light and darkness, God and the world, heaven and earth, spirit and flesh, life and death, truth and error, love and hatred, the eternal and transitory, Christ and the world, Christ and the devil, the Church and the world, the children of the world and the children of the devil, present Christianity attaining to victory through contest. The character of this dualism cannot be mistaken. The complete separation of mankind into such opposites is a genuine Gnostic feature. But while the gospel advances some way along with Gnosticism, it differs from it in dispensing with *œons* and their *pleroma* by substituting the Logos as the sole mediator between God and the Cosmos. The eternal Logos unites and reconciles the Supreme One and the world. He is the mediating principle; and it is only in him that a right view can be had of the spiritual and material as alike under God's sovereignty. The way is effectually prepared for putting an end to Gnostic dualism by the intervention of a principle that unites opposites.

The dualism in question carries us into the Gnostic age, affording another proof of the gospel's post-apostolic origin. It is beside the mark to say that 'the doctrine of St. John could not have been developed'[1] from the systems described by Irenæus, because it is simple and they are complex; when the writer's object was to supersede the current forms of Gnosticism by an eclectic gnosis. The gospel introduces the reader at once into the circle of Gnostic ideas; but in one respect it is antagonistic to them, and uses part of their vocabulary in a way of its own.

(*c.*) The mode in which the Jews are depicted is in harmony with the purpose of the gospel. Their character presents no development. They resist heavenly truth, are children of darkness and of the devil, and must therefore perish in their blindness. They are spoken of as external to the writer, as if he did not belong to them. Jesus speaks of *your* law in addressing them, as if he had nothing to do with it. They misapprehend his meaning habitually by taking his words in a literal sense. Their perception is so dull that they attach a gross meaning to that which is figurative. Nicodemus is an example of this, though he occupied a superior position. It is only the children of light who perceive the truth which the incarnate Logos communicates. The common people, whose eyes are covered with the thick film of ignorance, seek him because he multiplies bread and satisfies their appetite, not because he himself is the bread of life; and the chief priests are especially hardened. 'The Jews' murmur at Jesus's saying that he was the bread that came down from heaven, because they know he was Joseph's son. They misunderstand him so much when he told them that they could not come whither he went, that they suppose he is going

[1] See Wilkins's Excursus A. appended to his *Commentary on St. John* p. 426, school edition.

to commit self-murder; a sin abhorred by the nation. They are also represented as saying in mockery, 'Will he go to the dispersed among the Gentiles, and teach the Gentiles?' because they do not know the meaning of his language, that they would seek and not find him after he had gone away. The same stupidity is observable in the people, when they hear about a man keeping his sayings and never seeing death; and about his seeing Abraham, though he was still under fifty years of age. The evangelist goes so far as to state that they *could not* believe on Jesus, because God had blinded their eyes and hardened their heart (xii. 39, 40); and the same idea is repeated in v. 44; viii. 43, representing in the very strongest manner their hardness of heart—their almost physical inability to apprehend the truth. This type of Jewish unbelief is uniform throughout the gospel. It is announced at the commencement and remains the same. 'The light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not.' 'He came unto his own, and his own received him not.' There is no progress in the evangelical history. The opposition of Jesus's enemies, the storm destined to burst on his head, recedes or abates only to assume increased fury. The final catastrophe does not come after gradual preparation or successive steps announcing its approach; it is seen at first. The synoptists, especially Matthew, present a marked contrast. In the fourth gospel, the Jewish people are children of darkness all along, blind to the Light of the world who came down from heaven. The one part of mankind that stands out in direct contrast with the children of God and of light, is identified with the Jewish nation. It is they who are the children of darkness with minds blinded to the truth. Dualistic humanity has its black side in the Jews. Surely this implies that the writer was outside the nation, or completely alienated from that narrow-minded people. He could scarcely have been the

apostle John ; for though it be granted that he had lived on Gentile ground for thirty years after the Jewish polity had ended, the heart of the apostle could not have forgotten his fellow-countrymen, or ceased to commiserate their fate. Though they had crucified the Saviour and opposed his disciples, John must have retained some sympathy for them, and have depicted their unbelief in colours less uniformly dark. The Apocalypse shows that he was far from insensible to the ties of race.

The force of this argument is untouched by saying, that John, writing at the end of the first century, regards the nation after its final apostasy, when the distinctions of party were lost in their common unbelief ; because the epithet 'the Jews' occurs in the words of Christ himself (xiii. 33). Did John put his own phraseology here into the mouth of the speaker ? The impugners of the argument cannot say so, unless they abandon plenary inspiration. If they do not believe that the evangelist himself put the epithet into the mouth of Christ, the validity of the argument remains.

(*d.*) The anti-millennarian character of the gospel stands out in strong contrast to other parts of the New Testament. Instead of a second advent of Christ, the fourth gospel implies that the first is the only manifestation. Instead of the future judgment of the whole world, judgment takes place in the present. There is no external kingdom over which the returning Messiah presides in splendour—the kingdom of Christ is spiritual, and the Christian Church is led by the Spirit. The believer enters upon everlasting life here, for we read that 'he who keeps Christ's saying shall never taste of death.' Thus the Jewish Christian machinery of a solemn, future, external, judicial process conducted by the Son of man returning with hosts of angels, a thousand years' reign of the saints on earth, and cognate doctrines—as contained in other portions of the New Testament, give place to a judgment of the believer

within himself and his immediate possession of everlasting life. Such anti-millennarianism, conveyed in a peculiar eschatology far transcending that of the synoptists, savours of Gnosticism. The words which are put into the mouth of Jesus, 'whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die,' are not far from the Gnostic idea of a spiritual or internal resurrection excluding any external one. All this is opposed to John's authorship.

(*e.*) Another characteristic of the gospel is, that Jesus seldom speaks in parables and gnomes, but commonly in longer speeches, the parts of which are loosely connected, with repetitions. Though the character of the discourses is varied; the words of the Baptist, for example, bearing a different stamp from that of the colloquy with Nicodemus, which differs again from the conversation with the woman of Samaria; the exposition of the Logos-idea runs through them all. Luthardt himself admits, that the language of Jesus and the evangelist can hardly be separated; he might equally allow that the theology of the latter runs through the discourses of Jesus, as is exemplified in the 17th chapter, notably in the third verse, where the words '*Jesus Christ*, whom thou hast sent,' are unsuitable in the lips of Jesus himself. The proper name *Jesus Christ* is foreign to his time, and appears first in Paul's writings. The parable was adopted, as an easy method of conveying instruction to minds spiritually dull. Though it was employed with relation to the people generally not the disciples, we know that the latter themselves were slow to understand it. Yet in the fourth gospel the mysteries of the union between the Father and the Son, as well as the union of believers with both, are freely handled. The spiritual region is entered, and marvellous are the revealings of Christ's nature. The reader is favoured with a glimpse of the uncreated glory; while the relations of Father, Son, and Spirit

are expressed with a shadowy dimness befitting the subject. Theosophic mysticism appears. The objective teaching which charms the reader of the synoptics, and bespeaks the Galilean teacher by its simple purity, is absent. Abstract conceptions and language labour to set forth profound relations in the region of the divine.

(*f.*) There is a symbolism akin to the philosophical tendency in Philo, by virtue of which the author loves to look at facts as the representatives of ideas; to make little account of the visible in comparison with the thoughts it reflects. The material is subordinated to a higher reality of which it is merely the sign. History is viewed in a superior light, being valued only in proportion as it is the emblem of spiritual truth. The writer is an idealist or *pneumatic* man, penetrating the thick veil of material appearances, and seizing the truth they embody. Historical facts are selected and viewed with a symbolical purpose. This tendency is exemplified in fixing the death of Jesus on the day in which the Jews ate the passover, instead of the day after. He himself was the true paschal lamb, of which the other was the type. Type and antitype must coincide. In like manner, the Roman soldiers did not break the legs of Jesus, as they did those of the two malefactors, that the Scripture might be fulfilled which says, a bone of the paschal lamb shall not be broken. And why is it stated, that when one of the soldiers pierced his side water and blood came forth? Is it not to show the spiritual influences flowing from his person; the cleansing power which he exerts on believers? Such is the hidden truth imaged forth by the material fact, and giving it all its importance. Another example appears in the spiritualising of the manna in the 6th chapter, where the evangelist somewhat incongruously puts the words 'I am the bread of life' into the mouth of Jesus himself. In like manner the 'living water' spoken of

in the conversation with the woman of Samaria is the main idea for which the drawing of water at Jacob's well is adduced. At the spot where Judah and Ephraim once gave drink to their flocks in brotherly friendship, the union of a separated Church, consisting of Jews and Gentiles, is shadowed forth—a Church drinking from the fountain of life.

The act of washing the disciples' feet, with which the history of Christ's passion opens, is also symbolical. It is the last evidence of his love to the disciples, the concluding act of their purification. The whole character of the episode is allegorical.

The miracles peculiar to the gospel were also meant to shadow forth ideas in harmony with the Logos-theory of the writer. The raising of Lazarus shows that the Word is the resurrection and the life spiritually, who communicates that life to believers. The cure of the man born blind serves to point out Christ as the Light of the world. He gives sight to the spiritually blind. The change of water into wine at the commencement of Christ's ministry represents the new and spiritual religion taking the place of the old Jewish one. When water failed, when the inspiration of Moses and the prophets had become ineffective, a higher must take its place to nourish and satisfy the soul. The miraculous feeding of five thousand symbolises the spiritual nourishment that comes from Jesus. The cure of the man so long impotent, lying at the pool of Bethesda, represents Christ as the creator of a new life of vigorous health to the higher nature. It is this idealism which has always commended the gospel to the reflective mind. The world of ideas is the true and only world that deserves serious thought; and the material one is little else than its echo. How comes it then, that the gospel sometimes presents a sensuous character—that while it is highly ideal and spiritual, it is also outward and materialistic? There is even a

juxtaposition of incongruous elements. Of this there are several notable examples, as in v. 24–28, where the language is first symbolical and immediately after material; the resurrection and judgment being represented as spiritually consummated even now, while they are described as external and miraculous. The advent of Jesus is internal and external; man's judgment the same. Another instance occurs at vi. 53–58, where eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of man are expressed in gross terms; while immediately after it is stated that it is the spirit which quickens, the flesh profiting nothing. This incongruity has been explained by the catholic aim of the writer wishing to give a popular narrative suited to all parties—a narrative not only spiritual and elevated, but material and carnal. If his spiritualism was to gain general acceptance it must be combined with grosser views, that a wider circle of differently minded persons might be suited. Such mixture makes the gospel difficult to understand; for how can we tell whether and how far the material statement is to be taken as symbolical through the medium of its spiritual counterpart. Is the one to be resolved by the other, or are both to stand as they are? These questions are hard to be answered. That the gospel has sometimes two sides apparently incompatible, a spiritual and a material, the latter meant perhaps for a coarse embodiment of figurative truth, is apparent. But the former is much more prominent; so that Clement of Alexandria was not wrong in calling the fourth gospel specially 'spiritual.' The carnal side, however, must not be overlooked in any judgment of the whole, for it may possibly indicate the catholic character which the author meant to give his work, though it is not so frequent as to recommend the idea. Such twofold statements occasion mysticism, a feature not unknown to ancient and modern philosophies, which attracts

the thoughtful and pleases persons unused to reflection.

The tendency of these remarks is to show, that the gospel has sometimes a twofold aspect, or rather that its prominent aspect is broken in upon by an exceptional feature. If it be thought that the miracles are more strikingly objective than those of the synoptists, we reply that, even in relation to them, the faith that requires such phenomena for its production is an imperfect and inferior one. When Thomas was convinced that the identical Jesus had risen again, it is said, 'blessed are they that have not seen and have believed.' Miracles, however striking, are but signs of the divine mission of Christ, with which true faith can dispense. It is best to believe in the Word without external exhibitions of his power. His person, full of grace and truth, communicates spiritual life to the divine consciousness in men.

(*g.*) There is little doubt that the writer was acquainted with the synoptics or the traditions embodied in them, for they are presupposed if not repeated in different connections and altered forms. The gospel must also have some true particulars of Christ's life in addition, which were current among John's followers in Asia Minor. The memory of the aged apostle must have retained things which would be repeated by his hearers and pass from one to another, a few perhaps of Jesus's pregnant sayings among them, such as 'God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved;' 'I am the good shepherd,' etc. etc. These served as texts which the writer often expanded improperly, like the statement 'all that ever came before me are thieves and robbers;' just as ideas are attributed to the Baptist (i. 29, etc.) which are foreign to his mind. But what can be finer than some expressions in the unhistorical record of the interview with the Samaritan woman which contains

noble sentiments about the worship of God? The writer's genius appears most in the longer discourses; not in the arrangement of them but in their ideas; for the absence of systematic disposition with repetitions detracts from their proper effect. Yet they are marvellous effusions withal, as though the author had reached the heart of the Master's teaching. The genuine ingredients lie in incidents of Jesus's life rather than his sayings.

Mr. Arnold assigns too much to the authentic department. According to him, the writer was a theological lecturer who got a stock of materials from John, a second harvest of *logia* after the first had been reaped. These he continued and developed, altering their form not their substance. Changing the gnomic shape of the sayings of Jesus, he connected them into articulate and flowing discourse. He was therefore a redactor or editor, without the genius of an inventor. Being a Greek, he lacked the knowledge of Jewish localities and usages.

This is little more than an ingenious hypothesis. The source whence the evangelist is supposed to have got his crop of genuine themes—themes confessedly above the heads of the disciples, is an improbable one, because John was a Jewish Christian of the type conspicuous in the Revelation. The sayings contained in the gospel are what he would least remember. The attempt to explain away *tendence* is unsuccessful, eminently so in the notable example given at xix. 36, where the words are not from the 34th Psalm but from Exodus xii. 46. The harvest of *logia* gathered from John, with their profound and mystic sense, which the editor redacted and combined, must be assigned to the imagination of the critic. Discourses so unsensuous and unmaterialistic could not have come from the memory of an aged Jewish Christian.[1]

[1] See 'Literature and Dogma; God and the Bible.'—*Contemp. Review*, vol. xxvi.

(*h.*) As the elements of which the gospel is composed are the historical and the ideal, the former subordinated to the latter, it is not always easy to distinguish them; for the historical narratives are sometimes allegorical, of which the account of the marriage feast at Cana is an example. Wherever the description is directed and dominated by the Logos-idea we may infer its ideality. If the choice were simply between the historic and ideal parts as to their respective authenticity, the former deserves the preference. The events narrated are not so authentic as Renan imagines; and the discourses are not so authentic as Mr. Arnold believes. Both have more of the ideal than is usually allowed; the discourses being chiefly the writer's free productions. If moderate theologians like Lücke, Ewald, Brückner and Wittichen admit a subjective tinge in the speeches of the Johannine Christ, their authentic element must be small.

(*i.*) It is natural to expect the nearest to Luke's Pauline gospel in the fourth. The lines of primitive tradition were carried farther in the third gospel than in any of the synoptics, and come towards the advanced stage in which the Johannine work presents the biography of Christ. Philosophical, æsthetic, metaphysical, Alexandrian, the latter goes beyond even the post-Paulinism of the epistle to the Hebrews, appropriating Gnostic ideas to efface the peculiarities of those sects, and to establish the religion of the incarnate Word as the absolute religion of humanity.

COMPARISON OF THE CONTENTS WITH THOSE OF THE SYNOPTICAL GOSPELS.

1. Similarity.

The following particulars are narrated by John and the synoptists.

The cleansing of the temple, ii. 13, 22. Compare Matt. xxi. 12, 13; Mark xi. 15–17; Luke xix. 45, 46.

The miraculous feeding of the multitude, vi. 1–14. Com-

pare Matt. xiv. 13–21 ; Mark vi. 30–34 ; Luke ix. 10–17. The events preliminary to the miracle are omitted in the fourth gospel, in which the incident appears in a briefer and less original form, unlike what an eyewitness would give it.

Jesus walks on the sea, vi. 17–21. Compare Matt. xiv. 22–36 ; Mark vi. 45–56. Here there is a difficulty in reconciling the accounts. The narrative in the fourth gospel implies that Jesus did not go into the ship, as Chrysostom and others saw. If it be so, the contradiction is irreconcilable, and the wonder is magnified.

Jesus is anointed by a woman in Bethany, xii. 1–8. Compare Matt. xxvi. 6–13 ; Mark xiv. 3–9 ; perhaps Luke vii. 36, etc.

There are a number of discrepancies between the fourth gospel and the first two synoptics. If Luke relates the same incident, it is more difficult to reconcile the statements.

Jesus's public entry into Jerusalem, xii. 12–19. Compare Matt. xxi. 1–11 ; Mark xi. 1–11 ; Luke xix. 29–44.

Jesus points out his betrayer, xiii. 21–26. Compare Matt. xxvi. 21–25 ; Mark xiv. 18–21 ; Luke xxii. 21–23.

He foretells Peter's denial, xiii. 36–38. Compare with Matt. xxvi. 31–35 ; Mark xiv. 27–31 ; Luke xxii. 31–38.

His passion and resurrection, xviii. 1–xx. 29. Compare Matt. xxvi. 36–xxviii. The synoptic accounts and John's differ widely in describing the circumstances connected with these historical facts ; so that the ingenuity of harmonists has been taxed to the utmost in framing hypotheses to reconcile them.

Besides these particulars, sentences and proverbial expressions coincide more or less closely with parallels in the other gospels, but the agreement is seldom verbal.

2. The diversity between the first three gospels and the fourth is more striking than the similarity. Two-thirds of the matter is new; and even in describing the same things, the variations are remarkable. We can only adduce the prominent points of divergence that spring out of the general plan.

(*a.*) The most striking diversity relates to the day on which Jesus suffered. The synoptists represent him as celebrating the paschal supper the night before his death on the 14th of Nisan, so that he died on the 15th; the fourth gospel as not partaking of the passover but suffering on the day on which the law prescribed that it should be kept, i.e. the 14th of Nisan.

(*b.*) According to the synoptists, Jesus taking advantage of the last hours of his popularity proceeded to purify the temple, which was filled at the time with a multitude of traffickers. The fourth gospel puts this event at the beginning of his ministry, when his claims to be the Messiah could have been known only to a few. It is improbable that the act was repeated. But if he repeated his discourses or striking parts of them, why may he not have repeated a public symbolical act? We answer, the parallel does not hold good, because the act of cleansing the temple asserted his Messianic authority; and the apostles themselves were forbidden, even at a much later time than the first passover, to proclaim that he was the Messiah.

(*c.*) According to the synoptists, the ministry of Jesus was chiefly limited to Galilee, whose inhabitants were more susceptible of the new doctrine, because their modes of thought were freer in a territory of beautiful aspect where they came in contact with others besides the orthodox Jews of Jerusalem. It was not till the end of his ministry that he entered the capital as the spiritual Messiah, and attempted to impress his divine claim on the Jewish people. Only once in the course of his life did he come into the metropolis openly, and

the event issued in martyrdom. In the fourth gospel his ministry is almost exclusively confined to Judea proper. Its public commencement was there, the inaugural act being the expulsion of the traffickers from the temple. His presence in Cana at a marriage and his few days' sojourn in Capernaum immediately after, were only preparatory. How can this consist with the fact that his disciples were Galileans, and that he was regarded in Jerusalem as the Galilean prophet (John vii. 52) ? Because a prophet is without honour in his own country, Judea and Samaria rather than Galilee were favoured with his presence. In consequence of this diversity in the scene of his public ministry, the three synoptists appear to limit its duration to a year ; for he went up to one passover only before he suffered. The fourth gospel makes his ministry last more than two years, since he goes up to several passovers at Jerusalem.

The evidence of a few synoptic passages supposed to convey the impression that Galilee was not the exclusive sphere of the Messianic activity is unimportant (Matt. xxiii. 37 ; xxvii. 57 ; Luke x. 38 ; Mark iii. 7). The word translated *how often*[1] in Luke xiii. 34 and Matt. xxiii. 37, has been much insisted on, to show that the synoptists themselves suppose several journeys to Jerusalem prior to the last. It certainly seems that Jesus had been in the metropolis at various festivals to justify the Johannine representation. According to the context of Luke xiii. 34, etc., the pathetic lament over Jerusalem is delivered by one who had not visited it before, during his public ministry; though the purport of the lamentation supposes that several attempts had been made to induce the inhabitants to accept him as the Messiah ; while, according to Matthew, similar language is employed by the speaker who had entered the city no sooner than the day before. Both evangelists

[1] ποσάκις.

leave the reader to infer that no fruitless efforts to effect the repentance of Jerusalem had preceded the occasion on which the words were spoken. If therefore the fourth gospel furnishes a key to the expression *how often*, it does so by making the two synoptists self-contradictory.

Is there no way of vindicating the propriety of the word translated *how often*, without stultifying the evangelists who use it?

Two passages which are one in Matt. xxiii. 34–39 are separated in Luke (xi. 49–51, and xiii. 34, 35). Such dismemberment is not infrequent in the third evangelist; and is sometimes less correct than the united narratives of the first. Luke introduces the first part of the passage by 'Therefore also said *the Wisdom of God*' (xi. 49), meaning some apocryphal writing now lost which Jesus is supposed to cite, and which contained an account of the murder of Zacharias; and the probability is that Luke xiii. 34, 35, is from the same source. The subject is one—the treatment which the obstinate refusal of the Jews offered to the prophets and its consequent punishment. The woe pronounced upon Jerusalem and the narrative of Zacharias's murder seem to have been in the same document and the same passage; so that Matthew has given them together and Luke divided them wrongly. According to this explanation, *how often* in the mouth of divine Wisdom relates not only to the ministry of Jesus but to the successive offers which God made by different messengers to attach Israel and their metropolis to Himself. The reason why the first and third evangelists put the words into the mouth of Jesus was, because the Wisdom of the Jewish apocryphal books was identified with him. The evangelists did not observe, or if they did, they thought it of no consequence, that the expression *how often* would strictly imply more visits to Jerusalem than they had narrated. All they looked to was the per-

tinency of the quotation. The murder of Zacharias son of Baruch by the Zealots—and the 'Wisdom of God' refers to that—harmonises with the language 'your house is left unto you desolate' (Matt. xxiii. 38); for Jerusalem had been destroyed already when the apocryphal production appeared.[1]

It should also be noticed in opposition to those who lay so much stress on the word *how often* (Matt. xxiii. 37), that the synoptists represent the termination of Jesus's ministry in Jerusalem as more effective even than it is in the fourth gospel, so that the expression in question may well refer to several attempts which had been made to bring the inhabitants to repentance *during that time*—a time that may have continued several weeks before the passover at which he died; that a sojourn in Judea preceded that in Jerusalem (Matt. xix. 1–xx. 34); that the inhabitants of the metropolis flocked to Jesus in Galilee (Matt. iv. 25; xv. 1; Luke v. 17); and that all Jews, not merely the inhabitants proper, were 'children' of Jerusalem, as Luke himself understands the word (xiii. 34). Hence Weizsäcker's attempt to bring the synoptics into harmony with the fourth gospel on the ground of such places as Matt. xxiii. 37, are futile. It is impossible to make a three years' ministry out of the first three gospels.

(*d.*) The features of the histories are also divergent. The Jews of the synoptists are presented in lively and diversified colours, agreeably to their nature. A priestly hierarchy with a stiff orthodoxy is at their head, disparaging the free speech and life of Jesus, accusing him of association with publicans and sinners; while Pharisees are in league with Herodians to ensnare him on political ground. There are also distinguished Jews who are desirous to learn of him, rich young men attracted by his person, intelligent scribes not far from the kingdom of God. In the fourth gospel, the Jews

[1] See Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift* for 1863, p. 84, *et seq.*

have one character. The hierarchy, termed the chief priests and Pharisees, are all in all. Nothing is said of the Sadducees, the scribes, or the Herodians. We hear nothing of publicans entertaining him in their houses, of female penitents washing his feet with their hair, or of those possessed with demons unable to resist the power of the holy One of God. There are types for a variety of character, such as Nicodemus, the man born blind, etc.—studied types of an abstract and symbolical nature outside the sphere of actual life; but though their outlines are strongly marked, they are monotonous and mechanical, without the light and shade of nature.

(*e.*) In the first three gospels Jesus appears as a man, an extraordinary person endowed with marvellous gifts, 'the Son of man,' full of the divine Spirit and far exalted above other human beings by the indwelling of that Spirit. The difference between him and others is one of degree not of nature. Even Matthew and Luke, whose gospels contain the miraculous birth, assign him no existence prior to the earthly life. But in the fourth gospel he is represented as the personal Logos before he appeared on earth, by whom the world became what it is. He was in the bosom of the Father; and though incarnate in the man Jesus, possesses divine glory on earth. He is not the Messiah of the Jews in this respect.

(*f.*) The general teaching of the fourth gospel is different from that of the synoptics. In the former, Jesus is presented as *the truth*, the *only-begotten Son of God*, belief in whom is necessary to salvation. Eternal life is in him alone, whence it issues to the faithful. He is the eternal life. The highest importance is attached to the reception of him as the eternal Word. The man alone has life who has the Son. The object of his preaching is himself, or himself and the Father in him. In the synoptics, Jesus *preaches* truth instead of being

the truth; and the chief thing inculcated is coming to him, following him, obeying his precepts. The kingdom of heaven is promised to the humble, the merciful, those hungering and thirsting after righteousness; to all who have sacrificed their dearest interests for his sake, and remain faithful to the end. In the one gospel, salvation is attached to faith in Jesus as the absolute truth; in the other gospels, to a practical faith that exemplifies the spirit and self-sacrificing life of Jesus. The one represents the person of Christ as the origin and principle of all spiritual life; the others, self-devotion to God. According to the one, redemption consists in union with the Son of God; according to the others, in practical surrender to the precepts of Jesus. This is apparent from Matt. xix. 17, where Jesus says to the young man, 'Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is God;' or, according to another reading, 'Why askest thou me concerning good? there is none good,' etc., compared with the tenor of the fourth gospel, 'If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.' The one mode of speaking suits the speculative view which sees in Jesus the incarnate Word; the other betrays an earlier and more natural point of view before the historical tradition that Jesus did not proclaim himself the Messiah till an advanced stage of his ministry, had been broken by metaphysical theosophy.

(*g.*) The synoptists present an early phase of Christianity which includes old Jewish ideas and hopes. This is most observable in Matthew; least so in Luke. In the fourth gospel, Judaism and Christianity are widely separated. The author leaves Judaism far behind. The popular belief has free room for ideal views. Prayer is in spirit and in truth, confined to no temple, limited by neither time nor place. Abraham himself is of no farther importance than that he saw the day of One who was before him. The first three gospels adhere to

the conception of the kingdom of God with all the images it received from the Jewish mind; in the fourth, the phrase occurs but once, and the spirituality of the kingdom becomes prominent. The judicial process is not an outward scene but an internal act in John's gospel. Eternal life is not an object of longing desire but a present possession. In the synoptics, the spiritual powers of the higher spheres are embodied in angels and demons; in John, though heaven is opened, and angels ascend and descend upon the son of man, the spiritual eye of the mature disciple alone discerns their wonderful ministration.

(*h.*) According to the fourth gospel the resurrection of Lazarus was most important in its consequences, producing so great an effect on the Jews at Jerusalem that the Sanhedrim resolved to put Jesus to death. The miracle happened at Bethany, in the immediate neighbourhood of the capital, only a few days before the Saviour's triumphal entry into the city, which was but a prelude to his death on the cross. To perform it, he had come from the district beyond Jordan. The synoptists, however, make no mention of the incident, which is tantamount to their ignorance of it; otherwise they could hardly have omitted it. Indeed their narratives exclude it. A series of discussions with the chief religious men follows Jesus's triumphant entry into Jerusalem, after which comes the resolution of the Sanhedrim to put him to death—a resolution taken only two days before the passover. Not a word is said of the resurrection of Lazarus nor of the sensation it produced; though it was the immediate occasion, according to the fourth gospel, of the tragical end. It is difficult, if not impossible, to find a place for the miracle in the synoptic narrative.

(*i.*) According to the synoptists, the righteous are carried at death into Abraham's bosom, that part of Hades which the Jews termed paradise, where they re-

main till the resurrection of the just, after which they return to earth and participate in the joys of the Messianic kingdom with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; exempt from death and divested of sexual distinctions like the angels of God. But the fourth gospel represents the invisible world or heaven, the habitation of God, as the place where the righteous are reunited to Jesus, and into which the soul passes at death. Instead of a glorious reappearing of the crucified and risen Redeemer to judge living men and enter upon his earthy Messianic reign, which primitive Christianity reveals (Matt. xxiv., xxvi.), the Advocate or Paraclete supplies his place. The *day of the Lord* is not future but past. The judgment is not painted theatrically, as it is in the synoptics; it takes place in the heart, separating believers and unbelievers. The interval which the common belief puts between the ascent of Christ to heaven and the day of judgment, consists according to our gospel of a spiritual reign of Messiah, conducted by the Paraclete. The synoptic representation of the fate of the ungodly is that they will be consigned to gehenna, to undergo everlasting torture, agreeably to the doctrine of the Palestinian Jews; according to the fourth gospel their punishment is the loss of life. They abide in death. A resurrection is the privilege only of those whom the Father has given to Christ. Thus the eschatology of the two differs.

(*k.*) The supper at Bethany described in John xii. 1-9 disagrees with the synoptical account in several important circumstances. It took place six days before the passover (xii. 1); Mark says it happened two days before (xiv. 1). Our gospel places it prior to Christ's entering into Jerusalem (xii. 12); Mark's after it (Mark xiv. 3-8). The words of Jesus in defence of the woman are in Mark's gospel, 'she has been beforehand in anointing my body to the burying;' in John's,

'allow her to keep it till the day of my burial,'[1] implying that she did not use all the ointment in the vessel as Mark supposes; but that part was kept till the day of burial, according to the Master's wish. Mark says that the ointment was poured on the head of Jesus; John, that it was poured on his feet, which were wiped with Mary's hair. According to the synoptists the supper took place in the house of Simon the leper (Mark xiv. 3; Matt. xxvi. 6); according to the fourth evangelist, in the house of Mary and Martha, at Bethany. The name of the woman is not given in Matthew and Mark. In the fourth gospel she is called Mary.

A careful comparison of these discrepancies shows that the synoptical account is more probable, because the time allowed by the fourth gospel, from the 11th till the 13th of Nisan (xii. 12; xiii. 1), i.e. a day and a half, is too short for the final activity of Jesus in the metropolis; because the words in defence of the woman are not so suitable in John; because the act of wiping the feet with her hair is scarcely appropriate to Mary the friend of Jesus, and the pouring of the ointment on the head is more likely than on the feet; and because it is improbable that the name of Mary, had she done this act, would have disappeared from the synoptic tradition. The fourth evangelist seems to have got the name from Luke, transferring various particulars from the account of an anointing there recorded (Luke vii. 37, 38), to the present occurrence, such as wiping Jesus's feet and anointing them with ointment, which were appropriate expressions of deep penitence for sin. Besides, Luke's gospel seems to put the dwelling-place of Martha and Mary in Galilee. The unnamed village (Luke x. 38) can hardly have been Bethany, because Jesus did not come to it till a later period (xix. 29). Why then should the fourth evangelist transfer the abode of Martha and Mary to the immediate neighbourhood of Jerusalem?

[1] See the texts of Lachmann and Tischendorf.

(*l.*) The frame and substance of the synoptic gospels is biographical tradition; the fourth breaks away from tradition with a theological aim. The founder of Christianity conceived as the eternal Word proceeding from the Father's essence and becoming incarnate; the light shining in a dark world antagonistic to God; humanity's life-giving Lord; that was the phenomenon to attract cultivated Gentiles. The new gospel takes a comprehensive character, bearing a spiritual quintessence of the seething tenets by which Gnostics of different colours often destroyed the truth. The traditional is overshadowed by the spiritual—the objective by the subjective—the man Jesus by the incarnate Word —Ebionism by Divinity. The writer could not entirely forsake the region of biography else his purpose would have been frustrated; but this is a subordinate part of his plan, and is even made at times to serve the higher end by its symbolical form. The texture of the synoptists consists of traditions embodying the human life of Jesus; a christological spirit pervades the later production.

It has been said that the synoptical records contain the gospel of the Church's infancy; that of John, the gospel of its maturity. This statement is incorrect, because portions of the synoptics contain the results of developed Christian consciousness not belonging to the infancy of Christianity. Though the gospels are incomplete biographies, and their authors did not mean to write histories, their reconciliation is impossible. It is admitted that the memoirs are fragmentary, and that two supplementary records may be perfectly consistent; but the question is, Are they so? Do the elements of these fragmentary biographies sometimes exclude one another? Are the differences between them irreconcilable? We believe that the discordance is so great as to preclude reconciliation, unless by the sacrifice of fair criticism.

AUTHORSHIP AND DATE.

1. External evidence.

(*a.*) Bleek finds evidence of acquaintance with the fourth gospel on the part of Mark or the writer of the second, in Mark xiv. 3 (John xii. 3), verses 5, 6 (John xii. 5, 7); vi. 37, 39 (John vi. 7, 10); xiv. 65 (John xviii. 22); xv. 8, etc. (John xviii. 39); xvi. 9 (John xx. 14, etc.); ii. 9, 12 (John v. 8, 9); xi. 9 (John xii. 13).[1] In favour of the same position, De Wette adduces the compilatory character of the second gospel, contrasted with the originality of the fourth. The probability is as great that the similarities in the fourth gospel owe their origin to the second.

(*b.*) It has been thought that Barnabas was acquainted with the fourth gospel, because he speaks of Christ's being typified by the brazen serpent which Moses erected,[2] alluding apparently to John iii. 14. But though such general comparisons must have belonged to the current typology of the time, as the context shows, and contain nothing definite, Tischendorf does not scruple to cite the passage as evidence of the existence of the gospel, and of the writer's acquaintance with it.[3] He even converts the Barnabas-epistle into a witness for *a canon* of the gospels, i.e. the four present ones, in the beginning of the second century, though it contains but one express quotation from the New Testament, viz. Matt. xx. 16. Various passages bearing some resemblance to places in the New Testament books have been adduced from Barnabas, and may be seen in the index to De Gebhardt and Harnack's edition; but it has been well observed, that 'these resemblances do not argue any knowledge of the New Testament, as they are sufficiently well accounted for

[1] *Beiträge zur Evangelien-Kritik*, pp. 83, 200. [2] Chapter xii.
[3] *Wann wurden die Evangelien verfasst?* p. 96, 4th ed.

by the nature of the subject demanding them, and by their being so general as to belong to no Christian writer exclusively.'[1] Holtzmann has shown convincingly that the gospel was not used by Barnabas.[2] Neither is the date of the epistle so early as the commencement of the second century; A.D. 119 is nearer the truth. The Shepherd of Hermas has no quotation from the gospel; neither has it 'clear allusions' to it, as Canon Westcott says. The author of 'Supernatural Religion' refutes the clear-allusion hypothesis. De Gebhardt and Harnack agree with him. Prof. Charteris, however, outrunning his model Kirchhofer, gives five passages in attestation of the gospel. These, of course, are irrelevant.

(*c.*) Ignatius cannot be employed as an early witness for the existence of the fourth gospel, for his letters are supposititious. In the epistle to the Romans[3] he writes: 'I wish for the bread of God, the heavenly bread, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. . . . and I wish for the drink of God, his blood,' etc. etc. These words may probably refer to John vi. 32, 33, 48, 50–58. In the epistle to the Philadelphians we also read:[4] 'for if some have wished to deceive me according to the flesh, yet the spirit being from God is not deceived. For it knows whence it cometh, and whither it goeth, and makes hidden things manifest.' Here some words seem to be taken from John iii. 8; and the conclusion may perhaps refer to xvi. 8. The allusion is not so definite or probable as that of the first passage. Another place is in the epistle to the Philadelphians,[5] where we read of the high-priest 'being the door of the Father, by which Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob enter; and the prophets,

[1] Donaldson's *History of Christian Literature*, vol. i. p. 242.

[2] In Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1871, p. 336, etc.

[3] Chapter vii.

[4] Chapter vii.

[5] Chapter ix.

the apostles, and the church.' Here the reference to John x. 9 is doubtful. Christ is not called the 'door of the sheep,' as in the gospel; nor has the latter any mention of the patriarchs. The passage may have been in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, from which the Clementine Homilies adduce Christ's words, 'I am the gate of life; he that enters by me goes into life' (iii. 52). Ignatius shows that 'the catholic Church' had 'the gospel' and 'the apostle,' the two constituent portions of the New Testament; and it can hardly be doubted that the former[1] embraced the fourth gospel, though it may have had an extra-canonical one also. But the so-called Ignatius is not an apostolic father, and the productions bearing his name were not prior to the middle of the second century. It is a bold step on the part of Tischendorf to assume the authenticity of the seven Greek epistles on the ground of Eusebius's acknowledgment of them and Barnabas's attestation, as if the historian's testimony possessed critical worth, and the epistle of Barnabas were authentic. The authenticity of the seven epistles cannot be proved by another unauthentic epistle; and Eusebius is untrustworthy in many respects. It is ascertained that Ignatius's journey to Rome to suffer martyrdom there is mythical, and that he died at Antioch not Rome, A.D. 115, when Trajan spent the winter at Antioch, while he was on his Parthian expedition.

(*d.*) Polycarp does not notice the fourth gospel, but seems to have known the first epistle of John. In his letter to the Philippians[2] he writes, 'for whosoever does not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is an antichrist' (1 John iv. 3). Doubts about the letter's authenticity have been raised by different scholars; by Daille against the 13th chapter, and by Ritschl, who supposes interpolation in various places. It appears to us a later production than Polycarp's time. The date

[1] The εὐαγγέλιον. [2] Chapter vii.

of it is between A.D. 147 and 167, since it was written against the Marcionites, whose head flourished from A.D. 140 to 150. Zahn, who upholds the authenticity, seems to know its date exactly, for he says it was written *a few months* after Ignatius's death. We believe that the first epistle of John is cited in the document.[1] But that does not carry proof for the gospel, as Luthardt says it does. It has no quotation from the gospel. Even if the alleged writer had known it, he could not have looked upon it as the composition of his teacher John, because he defended by that very apostle's example an opinion about the paschal meal which was directly opposed to the fourth gospel.

(*e.*) As it is of primary importance to press every possible argument which may seem to favour the gospel's early composition, the account of Polycarp's martyrdom has been used for the purpose. After *the assumption*, for it is no more, that the narrative was written *immediately after* Polycarp's martyrdom (A.D. 155), it is asserted that in some passages the writers had the account of the fourth evangelist in their mind. These are ch. ix. 1., v. 2, xii. 3, xvi. 1, xv. 1, xvi. 2 : 'the resurrection of life,' 'the true God' (ch. xiv). In all these places the coincidences are so distant as to furnish neither proof nor probability. Steitz and Hilgenfeld adduce the first passage by way of comparison ; but Zahn justly affirms that it is too remote from John xii. 28. The rest belong to Dr. Lightfoot himself and are useless for his purpose.

(*f.*) With respect to Papias of Hierapolis (A.D. 160), the only reliable witnesses about him are Irenæus and Eusebius who had his work in their hands. Succeeding writers and anonymous scholia, professing to furnish information about him, must be received with caution. Jerome himself did not see Papias's work ; neither did Gobar or Photius. It has been asserted,

[1] See Zeller in the *Theologische Jahrbücher*, iv. p. 586, etc., and v. 144.

indeed, that Georgius Hamartolos got his information from the original; but his account contains incorrect particulars about Papias's narrative of John's martyrdom by the Jews.[1] Bishop Lightfoot admits that Georgius cannot quote *directly* from Papias; but, unwilling to deny all contact with the Hierapolitan worthy, he thinks that Papias was *the ultimate* source of his information. This is possible but improbable.

Irenæus's testimony respecting Papias's statements has been enlarged conjecturally. For example, various passages beginning with 'as the presbyters say,' or, 'the presbyters who saw John, the Lord's disciple,' or, 'the presbyters disciples of the apostles,' are supposed to be taken from Papias's book. One place in particular, where this father professes to give an account of the eschatological tradition of 'the presbyters,' introduces the words, 'and that therefore the Lord has said, '"in my Father's house are many mansions."'[2] Here it is uncertain whether a work of Papias be meant as the source of the quotation, or whether Irenæus inserted something of his own, or something borrowed elsewhere and altered by the text of the gospel. But considerable weight is attached to this inferential reasoning by Routh, Zahn, Luthardt, and Lightfoot, who assume that Irenæus quotes Papias.[3] Yet the passage has at the beginning, 'as the elders say,' and in the middle, 'presbyters disciples of the apostles say.' The elders may be Aristion and John, traditions of whom descended to Irenæus. But no; we are assured by Lightfoot that Irenæus is quoting from *a document*, which is none other than 'Papias's Exposition.' Conjecture must not be taken for evidence, and the whole

[1] The passage is given in De Gebhardt and Harnack's edition of *Barnabas's Epistle*, p. 96, etc.

[2] *Adv. Hæres.* v. 36, 1.

[3] Routh's *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, vol. i. p. 19. *Studien und Kritiken*, 1866, p. 657. *St. John, the Author of the Fourth Gospel*, by Luthardt, pp. 71, 72. English translation: *Contemp. Review*, xvi., p. 840, etc.

web which is woven for the purpose of proving this quotation from Papias is so thin as to be easily rent.

Eusebius says that Papias wrote a work called 'An Exposition of the Oracles of the Lord,' embodying traditions of trustworthy elders, and he extracts from it what relates to the gospels of Matthew and Mark. The historian's purpose was to gather the testimonies of old Church fathers, not merely about the *antilegomena* books, but the *homologomena*; and it is difficult to suppose that he would have been silent about Papias's acquaintance with the four gospels had he found them mentioned by the Phrygian bishop. But he is satisfied with giving the words of Papias respecting Matthew and Mark, with a notice about the Gospel of the Hebrews, concluding with 'this may be noted as a necessary addition to what we have before stated.'

If he disliked Papias's millennarianism, any traces of an anti-millennarian gospel would have been welcome to him. Instead of this he finds nothing nearer than a reference to the first epistle of John. The silence of the Phrygian bishop is a presumption against the authenticity of the fourth gospel, or its existence in his time. It may be said that we cannot know in what connection Papias communicated his notices of Matthew and Mark; or whether he had a definite reason for speaking of John at the same time, supposing him known as the author of a gospel; and therefore the conclusion drawn from his silence may be incorrect. But a work on 'the Lord's oracles' must surely have led the writer to a gospel containing many characteristic discourses of Jesus. Eusebius states that Papias inquired accurately 'what *John* said, or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples.' Hence it is hard to conceive that the gospel of an apostle who presided over the Asiatic church was excluded from Papias's plan. It is also strange that in the two passages where

Eusebius treats of the origin of the fourth gospel,[1] he should pass over Papias's account, giving in its place a tradition of Clemens Alexandrinus, so uncertain as to need the introduction *they say*.[2] As far as we can see, the general object of Papias would have led him to speak of John's gospel if it were known to be his.

Steitz has found indications of John's gospel in *the order* in which Papias enumerates the apostles as to whom he made inquiry. Leuschner and Lightfoot repeat the argument. John and Matthew are put last as *evangelists*. Luthardt gives another explanation of John's being last. Is not such minute inquiry trifling because conjectural ?[3]

It is also said that Papias describes some things as coming from *the truth itself*, meaning Christ who is called so in the fourth gospel (xiv. 6). So Hofstede, Steitz, and others, followed by Lightfoot. This is more than doubtful. The reference seems to be to the preceding context, where Papias says he took delight in those *who teach what is true*. At any rate, the allusion is nearer to the words in 3 John, 'Demetrius hath good report of all men, and *of the truth itself*.' In the first epistle also, the spirit is expressly called truth. The alleged personification in which many defenders of tradition exult wants a basis.

A prologue to the gospel of John in a Vatican MS.,[4] speaks of Papias's book, saying that the fourth gospel was given to the churches by the apostle while he was alive.[5] There cannot, therefore, say Tischendorf and

[1] *H. E.* iii. 24, 3; vi. 14, 3. [2] *φασί*.

[3] See Holtzmann in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift* for 1880, p. 74.

[4] *Vat. Alex.* No. 14.

[5] 'Evangelium johannis manifestatum et datum est ecclesiis ab johanne adhuc in corpore constituto, sicut papias nomine hierapolitanus discipulus johannis carus in exotericis, id est in extremis, quinque libris retulit. Discripsit vero evangelium dictante johanne recte. Verum Martion hæreticus cum ab eo fuisset improbatus eo quod contraria sentiebat, abjectus est a johanne. Is vero scripta vel epistolas ad eum pertulerat a fratribus qui in Ponto fuerunt.'

Aberle,[1] be a more definite utterance concerning Papias's testimony on behalf of John's gospel. Though this prologue may have been written in the fifth century, its statements are fabulous. What reliance can be placed on a document which says that Papias wrote the gospel from John's dictation? It is highly improbable that the writer of the prologue drew his materials from Papias's own work, as Aberle believes, proceeding to correct the passage on the assumption of transcribers' errors. Tischendorf prudently refuses to accept all the statements of the anonymous author except the first; though it is uncritical to take the opening sentence and ignore or neglect the rest. The passage has also been manipulated by Bishop Lightfoot, who is obliged to amend it conjecturally in order to make its testimony even partially plausible. In its present form, the evidence it gives is of no weight. The prologue in question was evidently written by one who knew nothing about the contents of Papias's book, and is contradicted by Eusebius. Marcion was not John's contemporary, as it affirms.

It cannot be argued that because Papias knew the first epistle of John, he knew the fourth gospel also; for they were not written at the same time. The epistle preceded the gospel and had a different authorship. The knowledge of the one, therefore, does not carry with it the knowledge of the other.

The noteworthy thing is, that Eusebius's extract from Papias makes no mention of John's gospel, though it does those of Matthew and Mark. The presbyter was acquainted with the first epistle of John and the Revelation, but the fourth gospel is ignored. Yet Papias is called a hearer and disciple of John as well as a companion of Polycarp. Neither Irenæus, nor Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History, *expressly* states whether John *the apostle* or *John the presbyter* is meant, for there were

[1] *Tübingen Quartalschrift* for 1864.

two Johns at Ephesus ; though the historian probably thought that Papias was a disciple of the presbyter, notwithstanding the Chronicon has another view. After all the selecting and rejecting process applied to Papias, he cannot be transformed into a good witness for the gospel's apostolic authorship. The patent fact confronts the defenders that Eusebius is silent about the gospel in connection with Papias's book ; though it is likely he would have noticed had he found it, because the bishop of Hierapolis was not far from the apostle at Ephesus. If not the apostle's hearer, he was at least a friend of Polycarp, the apostle's disciple. The silence of Eusebius is significant ; though Bishop Lightfoot makes no account of it here, and would rather represent it as favourable to Papias's recognition of the gospel, if he could. External evidence for the Johannine authorship cannot stand the test of criticism, as far as Papias is concerned. However manipulated, it does not answer the purpose of traditionalists.

(*g.*) Justin Martyr (A.D. 147–160) often refers to 'Memoirs' or 'Memoirs of the Apostles,' composed, according to his statement, by Christ's apostles and their companions. These Memoirs are expressly termed 'gospels' in three passages at least, and are looked upon as *the peculiar writings of Christians.*[1] That they included the gospels of Matthew and Luke there is little doubt ; perhaps also that of Mark ; probably the Gospel according to the Hebrews. But at present we are not concerned with his references to the first three. The question is, did the Memoirs include the fourth ? Did Justin know and quote it as well as the other three ? The answer can only be derived from a collation of all passages which resemble the fourth gospel more or less closely.

Let it be remarked as a preliminary point, that the first apology was presented to the emperor Antoninus

[1] ἡμέτερα συγγράμματα.

Pius about A.D. 147, and that the dialogue with Trypho was later, about A.D. 150.

A passage in the Dialogue with Trypho serves many critics as a keynote to guide inquiry. Justin says that the 'Memoirs' were composed by the apostles and those who accompanied them;[1] whence it is concluded that the four canonical gospels are meant. This language is too indefinite to be taken as evidence. It may suit Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, or it may not. An examination of all passages resembling the Gospel statements must precede a final decision.

'For Christ himself said, unless ye be regenerated ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. And that it is impossible for such as have been once born to enter the wombs of their mothers, is manifest to all' (John iii. 3–5).[2]

Here it should be noticed, that the first part of the passage departs from the Johannine terminology, because the double *Amen* is wanting; the *kingdom of heaven* is put for the true Johannine expression *kingdom of God*;[3] and the word *born again* stands for *born from above*.[4] Let it not be said that Justin's ἀναγεννᾶσθαι is equivalent to ἄνωθεν γεννᾶσθαι; for he uses ἄνωθεν in the sense *from above*, elsewhere.[5] That the adverb means in John iii. 3 *from above* is strengthened by its having the same signification in iii. 31, xix. 11. A comparison of the Clementine Homilies, which quote the same saying with a similar deviation from the Johannine diction,

[1] Chapter ciii., p. 372, Otto's 3rd edition.

[2] καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν, ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀδύνατον εἰς τὰς μήτρας τῶν τεκουσῶν τοὺς ἅπαξ γεννωμένους ἐμβῆναι, φανερὸν πᾶσίν ἐστι.—*Apol.* i. 61.

[3] Tischendorf states that βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν is in the codex Sinaiticus (John iii. 3–5) as well as in several of the oldest Greek and Latin authorities (*Wann wurden die Evangelien?* etc. p. 35). It does not stand in the text of his eighth edition in iii. 3; it is only in iii. 5, where the assertion of Jesus is repeated, that he edits the reading, *kingdom of heaven*, contrary to the weight of authority.

[4] ἀναγεννηθῆναι for ἄνωθεν γεννηθῆναι. [5] *Dial.* c. 64.

suggests the source whence it was taken, viz. the Gospel according to the Hebrews. A passage in Matthew is similar (xviii. 3), so that Jesus's expression passed through different forms, owing to various recensions of the apocryphal gospel. Ewald himself admits that Justin took the words from a lost gospel, but conjectures that the latter drew from John's; which few will assent to. It is possible that the words in the Clementines were taken directly from Justin; though it is highly improbable. And that Justin took them from the gospel is equally unlikely when his other citations are considered. It is also possible, that the Gospel according to the Hebrews derived it from John; but all we know of the origin and recensions of that document, tends to disprove the assumption. The second part of the passage is more favourable to the supposition that Justin used the fourth gospel. But the context shows that the words do not express Justin's own reflection, for he refers to tradition, which he never does when giving his own ideas. The whole passage was taken from a common source—from some apostolic writing as Baur thinks. The author of the Clementines and Justin drew from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. An examination of the two places in Justin and the gospel respectively, favours the priority of the former, for the latter shows more development. The idea of the one is enlarged and spiritualised by the other. Justin speaks of regeneration by the water of baptism. In his view, being born again is necessary; a result that comes through the laver of baptism or washing, where the remission of sins is obtained by him 'who is willing to be born again.' The writer of the fourth gospel, retaining the term *water*, attaches more efficacy to the Spirit. Hence he speaks of being *born from above*, being *born of water and of the Spirit*, and of 'every one that is born of the Spirit.' True baptism is, with him, that of the Spirit, as well as

water. Had Justin followed the gospel, his ideas would have been less sensuous. The unknown author who succeeded surpasses him in spirituality, ascending from the outward and inferior to that higher agency which gives entrance into the kingdom of God.

'We are called and are the true children of God' (John i. 12).[1] The context of these words in Justin dissipates the notion of their reference to any part of the gospel. It has been supposed, however, that the words in question show Justin's use of the gospel, because they agree with 1 John iii. 1. But the epistle preceded the gospel; and Justin may have used the former, without betraying acquaintance with the latter. The coincidence of words in the epistle with similar ones in Justin does not imply his use of the gospel.[2]

'As his blood did not arise from human seed, but from the will of God' (John i. 13).[3] Here Justin says of Christ, in relation to his supernatural generation, that he was not begotten by human seed but by the will of God; and John predicates a like thing of the children of God, not of Christ. Instead of referring to any passage in the New Testament, the father alludes to Gen. xlix. 10.

'For I say that he himself never did anything but what He that made the world, above whom there is no other God, intended that he should do and say' (compare John xii. 49).[4] Here the idea only is similar, the language is different.

'And he suffered them to feel him, and showed them the places of the nails in his hands' (compare John xx. 27).[5]

[1] *Θεοῦ τέκνα ἀληθινὰ καλούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν.—Dial. cum Tryph.* c. 123.

[2] Here is one of Dr. Abbot's inconsequential arguments.

[3] *ὡς τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρωπείου σπέρματος γεγεννημένου, ἀλλ' ἐκ θελήματος Θεοῦ.—Dial. cum Tryph.* c. 63.

[4] *οὐδὲν γάρ φημι αὐτὸν πεπραχέναι ποτέ, ἢ ἅπερ αὐτὸν ὁ τὸν κόσμον ποιήσας, ὑπὲρ ὃν ἄλλος οὐκ ἔστι Θεός, βεβούληται καὶ πρᾶξαι καὶ ὁμιλῆσαι.—Ibid.* c. 56.

[5] *καὶ ψηλαφᾶν αὐτὸν ἐπέτρεπεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τοὺς τύπους τῶν ἥλων ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν ἐπεδείκνυε.—De Resurrectione,* c. 9. The fragment is of uncertain authorship.

The context of this passage comes nearer Luke xxiv. 39, etc. than any other, though the place agrees exactly with none in the evangelists, and cannot be made up out of the four. The mention of the nail prints is certainly peculiar to John. But Luke tells us that Jesus showed not only his hands but his feet; implying that he exhibited the prints of the nails in both; and if a canonical source be sought for the citation, it should be looked for in Luke. It is more probable that some uncanonical gospel, such as that according to the Hebrews, contained an account of the appearance of the risen Christ, a supposition confirmed by a passage in Ignatius's epistle to the Smyrneans,[1] where Christ's words to Peter, after the resurrection, are in that gospel, as Jerome states. Or it may have been taken from '*The Preaching of Peter*.'[2]

'Wishing to show this also, as he said that our habitation is in heaven, it is not impossible even for flesh to ascend into heaven' (John xiv. 2).[3]

This resembles Phil. iii. 20. If borrowed from that, Justin made a mistake. Probably it belongs to some of the uncanonical writings current before and at Justin's time, from which he drew freely.

'I am not Christ, but the voice of one crying,' etc.[4]

These words are put into the mouth of John the Baptist, as in John i. 20, 23, but not in the synoptics. The context, however, points to Luke rather than John, since the words in Justin are adduced as the reply with which the Baptist met the general expectation of the people mentioned in Luke iii. 15. Perhaps we have in the citation the free form of a reminiscence based on the synoptics. In any case, it is too adventurous to assume a direct derivation of the words from the fourth

[1] Chapter iii.

[2] *κήρυγμα Πέτρου.*

[3] *βουλόμενος ἐπιδεῖξαι καὶ τοῦτο, καθὼς εἴρηκεν, ἐν οὐρανῷ τὴν κατοίκησιν ἡμῶν ὑπάρχειν.—De Resurrectione*, c. 9.

[4] *οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστός, ἀλλὰ φωνὴ βοῶντος*, κ.τ.λ.—*Dial. cum Tryph.* c. 88.

gospel, while other places speak against its immediate employment.

The words of Zechariah (xii. 10), 'they shall look upon him they have pierced,' are quoted by Justin[1] in the same manner as by the author of the fourth gospel; though the Septuagint and other Greek translations are different. Hence some infer that Justin followed the reading of the gospel. Is it not, however, as probable, that he took the words from the Revelation (i. 7), as the writer of the gospel did? We believe that the common source of the peculiar reading of Zech. xii. 10 is Rev. i. 7, whence Justin and the author of the gospel drew independently. If this be not allowed, it should be noticed that eight MSS. of the Septuagint have the word *pierced*,[2] as in the gospel, just as Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion translated; and that one of these MSS. may have been the common source of the evangelist's and Justin's citation.

'He was an only-begotten Son of the Father of the universe, begotten from Him by a special act as his word and power, and having afterwards become man through the virgin, as we have learned from the memoirs I shewed before.'[3] Here the clause 'as we have learned from the memoirs' refers to the fact of birth from a virgin. There is not sufficient reason to conclude that the prologue of the fourth gospel was the source of the title *only-begotten* in this place; it was derived from the Septuagint translation of the 22nd Psalm; and the 'memoirs' neither refer back to the first part of the sentence nor include John's gospel. The words 'and afterwards' separate from the preceding context the subjoined clause 'as we have learned from the memoirs.'

[1] 1 *Apol.* 52; *Dial.* 64.

[2] εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν for ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο.

[3] μονογενὴς γὰρ ὅτι ἦν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων οὗτος, ἰδίως ἐξ αὐτοῦ λόγος καὶ δύναμις γεγεννημένος, καὶ ὕστερον ἄνθρωπος διὰ τῆς παρθένου γενόμενος, ὡς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπομνημονευμάτων ἐμάθομεν.—*Dial. cum Tryphone*, c. 105.

The title 'only-begotten' occurs but this once in Justin; and was seldom used before the time of Irenæus and Tertullian. It would have been a welcome epithet to Justin had he found it applied to the Son of God in a gospel. Instead of it he has other expressions, such as, 'first offspring of God,' 'the only proper Son begotten by God,' 'first-born Son,' etc.[1]

We have given the quasi-quotations which have most resemblance to *real* ones; but many others are freely adduced to show similar parentage. Zeller examines thirty-five;[2] and more may be found in the twenty-seven pages which Hilgenfeld devotes to the bare citation of places in Justin descriptive of the evangelical history.[3] None shows conclusively that he used John's gospel. Credner gives only six places from which Justin may have taken citations; but he explains the three most prominent ones without deriving them from their apparent source, and asserts that nothing definite can be pointed out to show the father's acquaintance with the gospel.[4] The procedure of this scholar is different from that of Archbishop Thomson, who pronounces *ex cathedra* that there are twenty-nine quotations from John in Justin Martyr. Had he said *quasi* or *seeming* ones, the statement might pass unchallenged; but that there are so many *real* quotations, or even *one*, has still to be proved. It is true that Thoma has found many proofs of acquaintance with the gospel in Justin, but we hesitate to admit their pertinency, though he appends the idea that this father did not hold the Johannine authorship of the gospel or its canonicity.[5] Engelhard's hypothesis about Justin having

[1] *πρῶτον γέννημα τοῦ θεοῦ; μόνος ἰδίως υἱὸς τῷ θεῷ γεγέννηται; πρωτότοκος υἱός.*

[2] *Theolog. Jahrbücher*, iv. p. 600, *et seq.*

[3] *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Evangelien Justin's, u. s. w.*, p. 101, *et seq.*

[4] See *Beiträge zur Einleitung in die Biblischen Schriften*, vol. i. pp. 258, 259, 208, 251, etc.

[5] See Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift* for 1875.

not only the gospel but a harmony of the synoptists, is utterly improbable.[1] The coincidence between Justin and the gospel is never verbal. It *approaches* the verbal without *reaching* it. Lardner is therefore hasty in saying, 'it must be plain to all, that Justin owned and had the highest respect for the four gospels.' The argument of Bishop Marsh holds good: 'If when Justin quoted from the Revelation of St. John he thought proper to name the author, he certainly would have done the same with the *Gospel* of St. John.'[2] The same scholar, who collated many of Justin's quotations from the Septuagint, found a very exact coincidence with the text of the Codex Vaticanus. If the father pursued that method of citing the Old Testament, it was surely as necessary for him to do so in citing the New Testament; yet he has not done so. It is true that his language does not coincide verbally with that of the synoptists in all the places taken from them. There is this difference, however, that it *does* coincide exactly *in some*, where the first three gospels are the fountain; while the same thing cannot be predicated in a single instance of the fourth. It is also probable, that he was not restricted to the synoptists for his knowledge of the life of Jesus; but that he used other documents, especially the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Those who desire *proof* of this fact demand what is impossible, because the nature of the case admits of nothing more than probability. A *presumption* has often to supply the place of a *demonstration*. Here we are reduced to slender data, because the extant fragments of the Gospel according to the Hebrews afford small evidence of its state in the time of Justin. The *memoirs* of this father may be confined to the four canonical gospels; but we think it improbable they were so. If other documents called gospels were in

[1] *Das Christenthum Justin des Martyrers*, p. 345, etc.

[2] *An Illustration of the Hypothesis proposed in the Dissertation on the Origin and Composition of our three first Canonical Gospels*, p. 28.

circulation when Justin wrote, and there is little doubt of the fact; that of the Hebrews, which was one of them, may well have been used by a Jewish Christian before any gospel was canonised. It was well known and highly valued by many Christians in the second century, including Hegesippus, as we learn from Eusebius. Clement of Alexandria quotes it once even with the introductory phrase *it is written*: and according to Jerome, Origen used it often.

The fourth gospel presents peculiar characteristics unlike the other three, and stands out from them in its own individuality; it would therefore be cited more exactly than they, if used at all. Why then are the evidences of its employment shadowy and uncertain? Certain phenomena support the conclusion that this father did not quote the gospel of John. He appeals to the apostle's authority in the Apocalypse for the opinion that Christ would reign a thousand years in Jerusalem. But he never appeals to the same apostle's gospel in support of any view. On the contrary, he expresses sentiments directly opposite to it; such as, that the persons who rejected the expectation of the millennium in Jerusalem and assumed a spiritual immortality immediately after death, could not be called Christians. How inconsistent this is with the remarkable words addressed by our Lord to the woman of Samaria, is self-evident.

Again, the Logos-doctrine is different in Justin and the fourth gospel. In the former it is less definite, which may be partly owing to the fact, that he was a loose, illogical, unsystematic, and incoherent thinker; but partly to the vagueness attaching to all the derivation-forms of the Logos-doctrine, as well as to the original Alexandrian fountain of it in Philo. Yet there is still a distinction between Justin and the fourth gospel in the development of the Logos-idea. The latter recognises the personal distinction of the Logos and God

before the creation of the world ; Justin seems to make the Logos spring from God, in the first instance, at the creation of the world.

It is necessary to have a clear idea of the difference between the Logos-doctrine of John and of Justin, in order to see their independence. John's gospel speaks of unity between the Father and the Son (x. 30), and teaches the co-existence of the Logos with the Father from the very beginning (i. 1) ; Justin makes the Logos originate *in time*. It is true that the gospel inculcates the ecclesiastical doctrine of the Son's subordination, along with that of his co-ordinate existence (xiv. 28 ; iii. 35 ; xiii. 3 ; xvii. 2, 24) ; but the subordination is not the same as Justin's. Such epithets as *the first-born of every creature*, *the first-born of all things made*, *first-born of all creatures*, are avoided in the gospel, as involving the idea of *origination in time*. It is, therefore, difficult to believe that the Logos-doctrine of Justin rests upon that of John. Their partial resemblance favours the opposite view. The pre-existence of Jesus, which had already appeared in Paul's epistles, and is also in that to the Hebrews, as well as in Barnabas, Clement, and Hermas, was developed by Justin through the Philonian Logos-doctrine. The expression *first-born* was taken from Prov. viii. 21, etc. ; and *only-begotten*,[1] which he uses but once, was derived from Psalm xxii. 21. His christological doctrine rests upon Prov. viii. 21 and Philo.

Had the fourth gospel existed, and been regarded as the work of an apostle by Justin, it would have been a welcome production. He would have used, in support of his views respecting the Logos, a document which expresses these views definitely and decidedly. That he should have drawn the proofs of his doctrinal opinions from the Old Testament and the traditions embodied in the synoptics rather than from the fourth

[1] μονογενής.

gospel, is unlikely. Thus where he collects the utterances of Jesus himself concerning his relation to God, for the purpose of confirming the Logos-doctrine, he can adduce nothing but what is in Matt. xi. 27; xvi. 16 (Luke i. 35).[1] Here the fourth gospel would have been most serviceable.

Although it has been said that the eminently spiritual character of the fourth gospel was ill-adapted to the mental state of heathens and Jews, we must still hold that it would have been appropriate in Justin to cite it. The very fact of its comprehensiveness, and the assertions of Jesus that Gentiles are to be partakers of his grace, must have been welcome to the cultivated Romans. Nor were the discourses unfitted for citation; those parts of them at least, which inculcate universal love.

The following is a brief summary of the arguments against Justin's knowledge of the fourth gospel.

First. The Logos who came forth from God, *his offspring, his first-born*, is the great subject of the 'Dialogue with Trypho.' This Logos is identified with Christ, and his pre-existence is of essential moment in the writer's view. Yet he does not adduce a single sentence from the prologue of the fourth gospel; nor does he quote that passage in favour of the pre-existence which is so much to the purpose, 'before Abraham was, I am.' The two places[2] which contain the most direct statements with regard to the pre-existence of the Logos are so indefinite that they have been explained very differently.

Secondly. The Logos-doctrine of Justin harmonises more with the person of Jesus as depicted in the synoptics than with the Christ of the fourth gospel. In his human development, the Logos is the synoptic Jesus, not the idealised Christ of the gospel. He grows like other men, makes ploughs and yokes for his father

[1] *Dialog. cum Tryph.*, c. 100.

[2] *Apol.* ii. c. 6, ed. 3 Otto, p. 113; and *Dialog. cum Tryph.* c. 62, p. 220.

Joseph, and is baptized by John. Justin does not adopt the particulars in the fourth gospel which are contrary to those of the synoptists. He ignores the simultaneousness of the Baptist's ministry and that of Jesus, which he would have perceived from John i. 15 ; iii. 23, etc. The cleansing of the temple is mentioned in conformity with Matthew's account not John's. Simon receives the name Peter after his confession, as in Matt. xvi., not as in John i. 42. Justin also supposes that Jesus when dying was forsaken by all who knew him, contrary to xix. 26. In short, he follows the synoptic history throughout, not that of the fourth gospel.

Thirdly. Remarkable as the miracles of the fourth gospel are, Justin never mentions any.

Fourthly. He speaks often of the Holy Spirit and how he acts ; but he never alludes to him as the paraclete or to Christ sending him, after his departure. The language of the synoptists is the source whence he draws his descriptions, not the remarkable discourses of Christ in the fourth gospel.

Fifthly. Since neither Marcion nor Apelles thought that Christ should return as judge of all, the fourth gospel does not speak of his personal return in this capacity. It resolves the second advent into that of the paraclete, Christ's spiritual vicegerent. In this respect, Justin differs from the gospel and agrees with the synoptists ; for he often speaks of Christ's coming with glory from heaven or upon the clouds, as judge of all. Whether he would have adopted the more spiritual view had he been acquainted with the fourth gospel, cannot be affirmed ; he simply took the synoptic one, though he was a Montanist for a while.

Sixthly. Justin says that Christ's sayings were 'short and concise, for he was no sophist,'[1] implying unacquaintedness with the extended discourses which characterise John's gospel. This agrees with a state-

[1] *Apol.* i. c. xiv.

ment, in the Clementine Homilies, 'he was wont to make concise utterances about things concerning the truth.'[1]

Seventhly. He appeals to Christ's teaching to show the pure maxims and morality of Christians, quoting many of Christ's sayings, especially those relating to mutual love, which surpass any belonging to heathen philosophy. But he does not cite the most striking saying of Christ, 'A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another as I have loved you.'

Eighthly. Many epithets are applied to God by Justin; but none of them affords an insight into his idea of the spirituality of the divine nature. Indeed it has been doubted whether he fully believed in that spirituality, since he speaks of 'the indescribable glory and *shape* of God.'[2] How would his conceptions have been elevated if not corrected, by the sublime saying, 'God is spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth'?

Though Justin calls the Logos the first-begotten of the Father, proceeding from His essence, and even styles him God, he distinguishes him personally from the Father and marks his subordination. What chiefly shows the fourth gospel not to have been the source of his doctrine is his use of the term Logos not as a specific or distinctive appellation, but merely one among many others, such as lord, son, angel, king, priest, apostle, wisdom, chief captain, etc.; one who ministers to the will of the Father and declares to men what he wishes. We are, therefore, constrained to believe, that Justin's Logos-doctrine was that of his time, with no mark of its derivation from a gospel which would have pointed it more precisely and been a welcome support.

Explanations of Justin's manner of quoting and reasons for its use are readily supplied. He was writing for unbelievers, the emperor, senate and people of

[1] *Homil.* xvii. 6.

[2] *Apol.* c. ix.

Rome; and in his dialogue, he was arguing with a Jew who would not have accepted an assertion of John or a declaration of Christ as a proof of its truth. Like the other fathers, too, he quoted very loosely or from memory, abridging, transposing, paraphrasing, combining different passages, altering words or expressions for equivalent ones, etc. etc. In the case of the dialogue where he was proving the pre-existence of Christ, was it irrelevant to cite a passage exactly, or to adduce a declaration of Christ himself in the fourth gospel because Trypho might not have accepted it? Do disputants refrain from saying what their opponents may not admit? But Justin *does* bring foward to Trypho the utterances of Jesus.[1] He cites John, 'one of the apostles of Christ' for the doctrine of the millennium; and subjoins Christ's own words on behalf of it.[2] If therefore the millennium was supported by the express testimony of John, surely it was open to Justin and equally appropriate to cite the gospel of the same apostle on behalf of his Logos-doctrine. As to his looseness of quotation, how comes it that none of the passages supposed to be taken from the fourth gospel is verbally correct? Has he never stumbled on the very words of the original? Was it in no case important that he should do so?

The result of our inquiry into Justin's writings is, that his use of the fourth gospel is not proved. The allusions collected by Semisch, Thoma, and others do not show it, neither does Justin's christology. Even the two passages adduced as plain evidence of the fact by Ewald are invalid; that in the 'Apology'[3] respecting *regeneration* and the other in the 'Dialogue'[4] about *John the Baptist*. Justin would have used the work largely had he known it, since it was directly to his purpose. So would Marcion, who manipulated Luke, a gospel less serviceable to him than the fourth. The

[1] c. 51. [2] c. 81. [3] i. 61. [4] 88.

latter gospel must have commended itself at once to those who knew it, as capable of satisfying their higher aspirations; and it is therefore an improbable conjecture of Ewald's, that it was *written* some time before it was properly *published*. We are glad to find that the author of 'Supernatural Religion,' who has devoted nearly fifty pages to an examination of this subject, comes to our result. 'The inevitable conclusion at which we must arrive is, that, so far from indicating any acquaintance with the fourth gospel, the writings of Justin no only do not furnish the slightest evidence of its existence, but offer presumptive testimony against its apostolical origin.'[1]

(*h.*) The Philosophumena of Hippolytus say of Basilides, who lived in the first half of the second century (A.D. 125), 'the seed of the world, he says, arose out of things that are not, the word that was spoken let there be light, and this, *he says*, is what is related in the gospels; it was the true light which lighteneth every man coming into the world' (comp. John i. 9).[2] In another place, 'And that, *he says*, everything has its own times, the Saviour is a sufficient witness, saying, "My hour is not yet come"' (ii. 4).[3] Here the citations from the gospel are apparent. But does Basilides make them? Does Hippolytus give an extract from a work of his? That does not appear. Hippolytus, indeed, begins his account with 'Basilides then and Isidore . . . . *say*,'[4] but the language intimates nothing more than that he intends to speak of Basilides and his school, in the following section. The exact source of his information is not mentioned. Bunsen is confident that it is; and bids the reader look at the sentence preceding: 'If then, it shall be found that Basilides introduces not only the sense but the very words of the doctrine of Aristotle into our evangelical and saving

[1] Vol. ii. p. 316.
[2] Page 360, ed. Duncker.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 376.
[4] φασίν.—*Ibid.* p. 356.

teaching, what have we to do but to restore what is stolen, *showing to his disciples*, that, as they are pagans, Christ can be of no use to them. It is Basilides personally who is to be examined, and it is his disciples who are to be shown up as having lost Christ's saving doctrine.'[1] This answer is fallacious because it does not distinguish the disciples who professed to follow Basilides in Hippolytus's time and his *immediate* disciples. If Basilides is examined personally, why are the expressions *he says* and *they say* interchanged in Hippolytus's account. It has been said, indeed, that he uses the formula *according to them* when he quotes from the school, and the formula *he says* when he gives the dicta of the master, but the distinction is not followed; for a copious induction shows, that the formulas are employed loosely and indiscriminately, the one succeeding the other at random.[2] In one chapter, after naming Basilides, Isidore, and all their crew, Hippolytus begins the very next sentence with *he says*, which he repeats in a number of succeeding ones, and then suddenly introduces *these*;[3] proving that the subjectless *he says* means nothing else than the Basilidians generally. The whole treatise of Hippolytus proves him inexact in his allusions to the writings of predecessors, unless the text of it is corrupt. We agree with Hilgenfeld, who has adduced sufficient proof for his opinion, that a later form of Basilidianism, not that of the head himself, is described in the Philosophumena.[4]

It is hardly necessary to allude to a fact mentioned by Eusebius, viz. that Agrippa Castor says that Basilides composed twenty-four books 'on the gospel,' though Tischendorf employs it for his purpose; because

[1] *Christianity and Mankind*, vol. i. pp. 113, 114.

[2] Comp. the latter part of vii. 24 with the commencement of vii. 25, p. 368; and p. 376.

[3] See chapter xx. p. 356.

[4] See Hilgenfeld's *Das System des Gnostikers Basilides*, in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1856, p. 86, etc.

it is all but certain that the expression 'the gospel' is not equivalent to the four canonical gospels. It was one cognate to Luke's. Both Jerome and Ambrose speak of a gospel peculiar to Basilides himself, which they regard as apocryphal.

Hippolytus often uses *he says*[1] in his accounts of Basilides and others, where the subject of the verb is not given. It even occurs where no definite subject precedes, as in book v. 7, immediately after 'the Greeks say,'[2] and without specific mention of the writer referred to (Pindar), either before or after.[3] In like manner, where the Naaseni-doctrine is presented in the fifth book, the plurals 'they say,' 'they seek,'[4] pass into the singular '*he says*,' as soon as extracts from some work commence; but the writer to whom '*he says*' refers, is not given. After speaking of the Naaseni and using 'they say,' then 'saying thus,'[5] before an extract, Hippolytus immediately adds, 'Now all these things, *he says*,'[6] where the singular verb has nothing to refer to in the preceding part of the fifth book. So with respect to the Docetæ (viii. 9) the plural 'they think' is interchanged with the singular '*he says*,' without the subject of the latter being named.[7] These examples show the loose way in which '*he says*' is employed. It does not relate to a subject immediately preceding and named, but introduces the words of another; and its subject is merely an unnamed writer. When therefore a Basilidian doctrine is introduced by a *he says*,[8] it cannot be inferred that Basilides himself is the author. All that can be fairly concluded is, that it is found in a Basilidian writing. The fact is acknowledged that it was common to transfer the opinions of his followers to the founder of a sect. Irenæus did so,

[1] φησί. [2] φασὶν οἱ Ἕλληνες. [3] Page 134, ed. Duncker.
[4] φασί, λέγουσι, ζητοῦσι. [5] φασίν, λέγοντες οὕτως.
[6] ταῦτα δὲ πάντα, φησί.—Page 132. [7] Page 416.
[8] φησί.

why not Hippolytus? Even if the latter does give an account of Basilides's own view, so that '*he says*' means Basilides, little reliance can be placed on the statement of a man who asserts that Basilides drew his doctrine from Aristotle;[1] and that the Gnostic Justin was largely indebted to Herodotus.[2]

But a man who lived about A.D. 125 is too important to be given up, and, therefore, Dr. Abbot thinks there is 'good reason for believing that the gospel of John was one of a collection of gospels, probably embracing our four, which Basilides and his followers received as authoritative about the year 125.'[3] Basilides's followers are put with himself in 125; and both use the four gospels as authoritative long before the latter were canonised in the catholic Church. In other words, these heretics were orthodox with regard to the gospels before catholic Christians appealed to any books as divine except those of the Old Testament!

(*i.*) Valentinus (after A.D. 140) has also been adduced as a witness for the existence of the fourth gospel in his day, because Hippolytus in stating the Valentinian doctrine has, 'Therefore, *he says*, the Saviour says, "All that came before me are thieves and robbers"' (John x. 8).[4] The author does not say that he found the quotation in Valentinus himself, and therefore evidence is wanting for Valentinus's knowledge of the fourth gospel. At the twenty-ninth chapter of the sixth book Hippolytus seems to pass from Valentinus to the Valentinians generally, which has not escaped Duncker and Schneidewin, who alter the headings from *Valentinus* in the preceding chapters to *Valentiniani*. At the commencement of this chapter the writer says, 'Valentinus, therefore, and Heracleon, and Ptolemy, and all their school,' etc. etc., whence he passes to the singular *he says*, though the plural *they say* returns at the

[1] Page 348, 14.
[2] Page 216.
[3] *The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 87.
[4] vi. 35, p. 284.

beginning of the thirty-fourth chapter. Whether the *he says* refers specially to Valentinus himself or to a writer of his school, is left uncertain. Some may think that the doctrine of an inherent personal immortality which Clement of Alexandria quotes from a homily of Valentinus is taken from the fourth gospel because it resembles many passages in the latter (comp. iii. 36, v. 24, vi. 47, etc.); but Menander had already enunciated the same sentiments.[1] No reliance can be put on what Tertullian asserts: 'Valentinus appears to use the entire instrument,'[2] for the language implies doubt on his part, and besides he was inaccurate about the heretic in other respects, making him come to Rome when Eleutherus was bishop (A.D. 175–189), and calling him a fellow-disciple of Marcion's. Valentinus too had not a gospel of his own in addition to the canonical ones; as Tertullian or the pseudo-Tertullian wrongly states.[3] That Valentinus and his school did not derive their system of æons from the fourth gospel would seem to follow from Irenæus, who, though quoting Valentinian writings repeatedly, has no passage containing a clear allusion to the gospel, except one from Ptolemy (i. 8, 5). They used the discourses of Jesus in the synoptics, and passages from the Pauline epistles; none from John. The names of several æons, *Logos*, *life*, *grace*, *truth*, etc., were already current; nor is there any proof that they were borrowed by Valentinus from our gospel. The paraclete was not employed in the distinctive sense of John, but was applied to Jesus himself. It has been said indeed, that Valentinus drew his system of syzygies from the fourth gospel; but the Valentinians themselves appealed to a work different from the gospels as the source of their doctrine. The prologue of John was

[1] Justin's *Apol.* i. 26; Eusebius's *H. E.* iii. 26, 3; Irenæus, *Adv. Hæres.* i. 23, 5.

[2] 'Valentinus integro instrumento uti videtur.'—*De Præscript. Hæret.* c. 38.

[3] *De Præscript. Hæreticorum*, c. 49.

subsequently adapted to their system by an arbitrary process, instead of its being a fountain of the syzygies. On the whole, there is no ground for the belief that Valentinus himself knew and used the gospel. Irenæus's account of the Valentinian doctrine is chiefly drawn from the schools of Ptolemy and Marcus; Hippolytus follows Irenæus.

(*j.*) But though he was unacquainted with it, his disciples used it freely. Heracleon, A.D. 170–200,[1] wrote a commentary upon it, fragments of which have been preserved by Clement of Alexandria and Origen. It is remarkable, however, that the name of John does not occur in them. Ptolemy (A.D. 180), in his epistle to Flora, quotes the words of John i. 2, 3, as 'the apostle's,' but the corrupt state of Epiphanius's text at the place forbids reliance on the testimony.[2]

(*k.*) The fact that Ptolemy and Heracleon used the gospel has been applied by Bleek to show that it was already accepted in the time of Valentinus. Had the work appeared shortly before Heracleon, he argues that it must have been the production of a Valentinian, and so obviated the necessity of a commentary upon it to adapt it to the opinions of the sect, in which case it would not have been accepted by the catholic Church. Or, had it originated with the orthodox, it must have been rejected by the Valentinians. Since neither can be assumed, Bleek argues that it was in current repute when the Valentinian sect arose. The first alternative is plainly impossible. The gospel is not a Valentinian

[1] That Heracleon was not a contemporary of Valentinus, nor one of the earliest Gnostics, is proved by Scholten and Volkmar against Tischendorf.—*Die ältesten Zeugnisse betreffend die Schriften des N. T.* p. 89, etc.; and *Der Ursprung unserer Evangelien*, p. 126, etc.

[2] ἔτι γε τὴν τοῦ κόσμου δημιουργίαν ἰδίαν λέγει εἶναι (ἅτε πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ γέγονε καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ γέγονεν οὐδέν) ὁ ἀπόστολος, κ.τ.λ.—*Adv. Hæres.* xxxiii. 3, etc. The words in parentheses may be Epiphanius's; or they may belong to the epistle of Ptolemy. The nominative to λέγει is not clear. Judging by the preceding context, it would be σωτήρ; by the following, ὁ ἀπόστολος.

work. The second is based on a false assumption, viz. that the separation between the catholic Church and the Gnostics was such from the very beginning that the latter would have rejected a book claiming to be apostolic, because it came to them from the catholic Church. On the contrary, the Gnostics adopted the sacred writings, endeavouring to accommodate them to their own tenets by artificial modes of interpretation. The Gnostics were not critics but doctrinal interpreters, and readily accepted the ecclesiastical writings of the catholic Church, if useful in promoting their tenets. It is quite possible therefore, that the gospel may have made its appearance after Valentinus, and before Heracleon or Ptolemy, without prejudice to the opinion that the latter, regarding it as an apostolic work, commented on it as such. Had Valentinus known of its existence in Asia Minor, he would not have neglected it, since it presented points of contact with his system.

An examination of the treatise of Hippolytus does not bear out the strong statements of Bunsen, respecting its decisive influence on the authenticity of the fourth gospel. When that estimable scholar writes that, 'in many articles of the sixth, seventh, and eighth books in particular, we have an abstract only of the text of Hippolytus,' and speaks of 'the incomplete state of some other articles,' it is surprising that he should rely on passages in those very books about Basilides and the Valentinians, as if they were complete. Did he never suspect the precariousness of resting on a loosely employed *he says?*

(*l.*) In the fifth book of his 'Refutation of all Heresies,' Hippolytus quotes several passages from an Ophite work which shows a knowledge of the fourth gospel. He writes: 'This, *he says*, is what is written, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit"' (John iii. 6).[1] Here the

[1] *Philosophumena*, p. 148.

author of the work, the subject of *he says*, is not given. Again ; 'For all things, *he says*, were made by him, and without him not one thing was made. But that which was in him was life' (John i. 3).[1] Again, 'The Saviour said, no man can come to me unless my heavenly Father draw him' (vi. 44).[2] Still farther : 'Of which, *he says*,[3] the Saviour spoke, "If thou hadst known who it is that asks, thou wouldst have asked of him, and he would have given thee to drink living, springing water"' (iv. 10).[4] Other places contain allusions to the gospel less distinct than these. Did we know the age of the Ophite writing, its bearing on the date of the fourth gospel would be important. Lipsius argues with effect that later forms of Ophitism are referred to by Hippolytus.[5]

(*m.*) Hippolytus's treatise also contains an account of a Gnostic sect denominated *Peratæ*, founded by one Euphrates. And he gives extracts from one or more of their books, containing several quotations from John. In v. 12, John iii. 17 is quoted ;[6] in v. 16, John iii. 14 ;[7] in v. 17, John viii. 44 ;[8] and in v. 17, John x. 7.[9] We need not dwell upon this testimony, in the absence of all knowledge of the author or authors quoted.

We admit that the Ophites or Naaseni and the Peratæ were earlier than Basilides, and are spoken of as such by Hippolytus ; but the point is, are the writings from which he draws his examples, those of the founders or the subsequent supporters of the sects ? Is the age of the sources which Hippolytus used the same with that of the originators ? The language in which they are described does not determine the question ; but the probability is, that the later adherents are meant. In expounding their tenets Hippolytus, according to his

[1] *Philosophumena*, p. 150.
[2] Ditto, p. 158.
[3] φησί.
[4] Ditto, p. 172.
[5] See Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift* for 1863, 1864.
[6] *Philosophumena*, p. 178.
[7] Ditto, p. 192.
[8] Ditto, p. 196.
[9] Ditto, p. 198.

wont, employs the subjectless *he says* as well as *they say*.

(*n*.) Hippolytus also speaks of the Docetæ, in viii. 8–11, giving extracts from their text-book or some other work. Among them is one express citation from John's gospel, iii. 5, 6, introduced by the usual *he says* without a subject.[1] The age of the sect is not early; for as Bunsen remarks, they presuppose the whole Valentinian school.

So far from Hippolytus furnishing valid evidence in favour of the authenticity of the fourth gospel, he is himself a testimony against it. The dispute in the Roman Church, as we know it from Hippolytus's treatise against the majority with their bishop Callistus, becomes intelligible only from the fact that the Logos-doctrine of the fourth gospel respecting a *God of God*, was looked upon as recent, and therefore hereticated by most as *bitheism*.[2] Monarchian Rome resisted for a long time the central position of the fourth gospel, as we learn from the Philosophumena. Had an apostle written the work, its cardinal doctrine could not have been considered an innovation at Rome, in the early part of the third century.

(*o*.) Marcion (A.D. 140) is quoted for the existence of the fourth gospel in his day. Tertullian alleges, 'if you had not dealt purposely with the Scriptures adverse to your opinion, rejecting some and corrupting others, the gospel of John would have confounded you,' implying that Marcion omitted the gospel of John on purpose. We place little reliance on Tertullian's assertions about Marcion. He was too passionate a polemic to be exact or careful; and often projected his own views into the systems of others, taking fancies for facts. It is very probable that he did so in the present instance, because in another passage, when saying that Marcion rejected the Apocalypse of John, he is silent about any such

[1] *Philosophumena*, p. 422.

[2] ὑμεῖς ἐστε δίθεοι.

treatment of the gospel. We know too that this supposed heretic preferred Luke's gospel, which he adapted to his purpose in various ways. Why did he not choose the fourth, whose anti-Jewish spirit suited his purpose better? As it speaks of the law of Moses as a thing outside Christianity, it would have been welcome. The prominence too which the gospel gives to love, is in harmony with the view of this warm-hearted advocate of pure Christianity. Far easier would he have found it to remove from the fourth gospel what did not agree with his notions, than to manipulate Luke's, which, though Pauline, is still tinctured with Judaic elements. But Marcion never uses the fourth, though its speculation is deeper and surpasses Luke's by embodying a Logos-doctrine inclusive of monotheism. The later Gnostics gladly availed themselves of John's gospel; why did not Marcion, if it were in existence? The value of Tertullian's testimony may be estimated by the fact, that he represents Paul's conversion to have been effected by a written gospel. And as to the gospels which this father looked upon as the primitive possession of the Church, he does not appear to have thought that they alone were accepted by Marcion, because he did not know whether the heretic regarded the apostles themselves, or false apostles, as the corrupters of the catholic gospels.[1] While therefore we admit that Tertullian may mean the four canonical gospels, when he speaks of Marcion endeavouring to destroy the credit of 'the gospels that bear the name of apostles, or also of apostolic men,' his mere statement does not prove that the heretic he combats had those works. Indeed all probability is against it.

[1] 'Sed enim Marcion nactus epistolam Pauli ad Galatas, etiam ipsos apostolos suggillantis ut non recto pede incedentes ad veritatem evangelii, simul et accusantis pseud-apostolos quosdam pervertentes evangelium Christi, connititur ad *destruendum* statum eorum evangeliorum, quæ propria et sub apostolorum nomine eduntur, vel etiam apostolicorum, ut scilicet *fidem*, quam illis adimit, suo conferat.'—*Adv. Marcion.* iv. 3.

(*p.*) The Clementine Homilies quote John's gospel in more places than one. Thus, in xix. 22, we read: 'Wherefore also our Teacher answered those who inquired of him with respect to the man that had been born blind and received his sight again, whether he had sinned or his parents, that he had been born blind. "Neither has he committed any sin, nor his parents; but that the power of God which heals sins of ignorance might be manifested through him"' (John ix. 2, 3).[1] Again, ['He, a true prophet] said, "My sheep hear my voice"' (John x. 27).[2] Though the writer uses the fourth gospel in addition to Matthew's, Luke's, and an apocryphal one, he does not seem to have attributed authority to it, or to have recognised it as the production of an apostle, since he adheres to the one-year ministry of Jesus, and takes liberties in interpreting John ix. Perhaps it was new to him.

(*q.*) The Testaments of the twelve patriarchs are also cited on behalf of the Johannine date. This witness is too late for the purpose, since it belongs to the second half of the second century. Apologists put it between A.D. 90 and 135, and then cite it for the prior existence of the gospel. Mr. Sinker's index gives various passages borrowed in part from the Gospel, such as *the Lamb of God*, *the light of the world*, *the Spirit of truth*, etc., which are far from proving that John wrote the fourth gospel. All that they attest is the existence of the latter in the second half of the second century, a fact which few deny. What would be to the purpose of apologists is the bringing of the Testaments into the first century, that their allusions to the gospel may subserve its Johannine authorship. This, however, is difficult. As long as the probable date of the work is after A.D. 150, it is useless to quote it as an evidence for the gospel's authenticity. Doubtless most of the New Testament writings had a prior existence; but it is misleading to

[1] Ed. Dressel. 1853, p. 392. [2] *Ibid.* p. 407.

cite it for *a canon* of Christian books regarded as holy at the beginning of the second century.

(*r*). Tatian (A.D. 160–185), who wrote an address to the Greeks, is a witness for the existence of the gospel in his day, since he says in the thirteenth chapter, 'And this is what was said, Darkness does not comprehend light . . . . the Logos is the light of God,' etc. Here the allusion to John i. 5 is obvious. In the nineteenth chapter we read, 'All things were by him, and without him not one thing was made' (John i. 3). Kirchhofer gives two other passages in which the gospel is referred to, but they are uncertain. It is difficult to ascertain the nature of his 'Harmony.' Neither Eusebius nor Epiphanius saw it. If the title[1] were given to it by himself, as Eusebius says it was, it may have been made out of the four canonical gospels. The testimony of one that did not see the book is little worth.[2] Epiphanius's words imply that Tatian did *not* give it the name himself. Dionysius Bar Salibi, a Jacobite bishop of the 12th century, says that Ephrem Syrus interpreted the Harmony, which began with the words, 'In the beginning was the Word.' As Ephrem was unacquainted with Greek, it must have existed in the Syriac language when he undertook to explain it. Theodoret, who saw and put aside, as he says, more than two hundred copies in his diocese, introducing the four evangelists in its place, had an unfavourable opinion of the work because it did not contain the genealogies of Jesus nor anything to show that Jesus was of David's seed. The Harmony was perhaps made

[1] *τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων*, or *τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων εὐαγγέλιον*.

[2] *ὁ Τατιανὸς συνάφειάν τινα καὶ συναγωγὴν, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως, τῶν εὐαγγελίων συνθεὶς, τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων τοῦτο προσωνόμασεν.—H. E.* iv. 29. Mr. Nicholson, in his zeal against the author of *Supernatural Religion*, holds that Eusebius saw the work; though the historian's words clearly imply the reverse. See the 'Gospel according to the Hebrews,' p. 126. The supposition of Lightfoot that the *οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως*, *I know not how*, implies no more than that the plan of the work seemed strange to him, is too like an ingenious quibble to be accepted.

up of the four gospels with certain omissions that bore upon the descent of Jesus. We learn from Epiphanius, that some called it the *gospel according to the Hebrews*, probably because it was without the genealogies, not because it was the same. Ammonius of Alexandria (A.D. †243) made another 'Diatessaron' or 'Harmony' which was confounded with Tatian's by an interpolator of Bar-Bahlul A.D. 963, and afterwards by Bar-Hebræus (†1286). Ebed-Jesu the Nestorian bishop of Nisibis (†1318) has even confounded the persons of Tatian and Ammonius. But they were distinct; and their harmonies were not the same, even though that of Ammonius began with John i. 1, and omitted the genealogy of Jesus. Victor of Capua in the sixth century says that Tatian called his work a *Diapente*, which suggests the idea of *five* gospels.[1] But this is a mistake, because Victor merely repeats Eusebius's account, and he himself describes it as 'one of four.' As it had the genealogies from Matthew and Luke, beginning with Luke i. 1, it was not Tatian's. We do not deny the possibility of Tatian using the four canonical gospels, but that the work is a proof of the *apostolic* composition of the fourth. When Credner affirms that Tatian's 'Harmony' was the same as the Petrine gospel and the Gospel according to the Hebrews, he adduces no proper proof of the opinion.[2]

(*s.*) Athenagoras (A.D. 177) is said to have used the fourth gospel, since we find these words in his 'Apology for the Christians' (ch. x.): 'But the Son of God is the Logos of the Father in idea and energy; for by him and through him all things were made, the Father and the Son being one. But the Son being in the Father and the Father in the Son, by the unity and power of Spirit, the Son of God is the mind and reason

[1] *Fabricii Cod. Apoc. N. T.* i. p. 379.

[2] *Geschichte der Neutestamentlichen Kanon*, p. 17, *et seq.* See Zahn's *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons, u. s. w.* 1 Theil. Tatian's *Diatessaron*, 1881.

of the Father.' (Comp. John i. 1–3; xvii. 21–23). The passage is too uncertain to be cited as a testimony. Neither it nor other places which have been referred to (in chapters 4, 12, 22) show quotation from the gospel. Athenagoras attributed inspiration and authority to the Old Testament, not to the New.

(*t.*) Celsus may have known the gospel, i.e. about A.D. 170 (not 150–160 as Tischendorf states), for he *seems* to have lived in the reign of Marcus Aurelius. He was not the epicurean Celsus, but a new Platonist of the same name, and his testimony is consistent with the fact of the gospel's origin about A.D. 150, twenty years before. It is not at all certain, however, whether Celsus *did* use the gospel, though Origen supposes it. The passages in Origen apparently showing it are doubtful,[1] as Bretschneider pointed out;[2] and Lücke candidly allows that Celsus may not have read the gospel. When Celsus says, *some* said *one* angel appeared at the sepulchre, *some* mentioned *two*,[3] it is not necessary to suppose that he had more than the synoptic gospels before him; and another place,[4] confidently appealed to as distinctly referring to John xix. 34, leaves it uncertain whether Celsus or Origen speaks of things in the fourth gospel. This remark also applies to ii 31, 59.

(*u.*) Two passages in the letter of the churches of Vienne and Lyons (A.D. 177) show an acquaintance with John's gospel. It is said of Vettius Epagathus: 'And having in himself the advocate, the Spirit, more abundantly than Zacharias,' etc. (comp. John xiv. 26). Another place is: 'And that spoken by our Lord was fulfilled, viz. that the time shall come in which every one that kills you will think he doeth God service' (comp. xvi. 2).

(*v.*) With Justin's works is often printed the epistle

[1] *Contra Cels.* i. 67; ii. 31, 36, 59; v. 52.
[2] *Probabilia*, p. 197, etc. [3] v. 52. [4] ii. 36.

to Diognetus, which is supposed to exhibit marks of acquaintance with the fourth gospel. Thus we read in the seventh chapter: 'God himself from heaven inaugurated among men the truth, and the holy and inconceivable Word, and fixed it firmly in their hearts, not sending to men, as one might fancy, some subordinate, either an angel or a prince, or one of those who order earthly affairs, or one of those entrusted with governments in the heavens, but the framer and architect of all things himself, by whom he shut up the sea within its bounds,' etc. The author of the letter was not Justin, as is evident both from the style and the theological standpoint. It could hardly have been written before A.D. 180, when Christianity had entirely emancipated itself from Judaism, and incorporated Greek culture with its essence. Overbeck argues that it should be dated much later; even in the Nicene age and the time of Constantine; while Zahn puts it between 200 and 300 A.D. Subtracting the eleventh and twelfth chapters, which are later than the first ten and from another hand, the epistle has no quotation from the fourth gospel. There are similarities of thought and language, derived from it perhaps; but it is quite possible that they originated in the circle of ideas out of which the gospel sprung. It is certain that the latter existed when the work appeared. In any case the epistle furnishes no definite information respecting the time and authorship of the fourth gospel. Bunsen's conjecture that Marcion was the writer, is improbable. That heretic would hardly have heaped indiscriminate abuse on the Greek philosophers generally, or asserted their eternal damnation with evident satisfaction.

(*w.*) Tischendorf lays much stress on an apocryphal production called the *Acts of Pilate*, of which he discovered several MSS. Justin Martyr quotes these Acts, and therefore they must be dated at the commencement

of the second century. The document employed the fourth gospel, and furnishes more valuable evidence in favour of the latter at the end of the first century than verbal quotations themselves would do in the time of Justin. Tertullian refers to the work as well as Epiphanius. Such is Tischendorf's argument,[1] which had been stated before by Ritschl, who asserts that *the original recension* of the work known to Justin and Tertullian mentions Lazarus.

The *Acts of Pilate* consist of two parts, printed separately by Tischendorf as A. and B. The editor rightly judges that the latter was written by a different person from the author of the former, and is of later origin. Justin describes, in language taken from the 22nd Psalm, as the evangelists also do, the piercing of Jesus's hands and feet on the cross, and the division of his raiment by lot,[2] referring to the Acts of Pilate; but in the now existing document no mention is made of the nailing of the feet nor of the casting lots for Jesus's vesture.[3] The proof of identity between the Acts of which Justin, Tertullian, and Eusebius speak and our 'Hypomnemata' breaks down, as Scholten has shown.[4] The Jews before Pilate reproach Jesus with his illegitimate birth.[5] This accusation appears for the first time in Celsus. The Ebionites or early Jewish-Christians always considered Jesus to be the legitimate son of Joseph and Mary. Besides, the Jews apply to Pilate an expression, *your excellency* or *highness*, which could hardly have been applied in the time of Trajan to a Roman procurator. We therefore hold that the present 'Hypomnemata' are posterior to Justin.

The language of Justin and Tertullian does not

[1] *Wann wurden die Evangelien? u. s. w.*, p. 82, *et seq.*

[2] *Apolog.* i. 35. See also 48.

[3] See Tischendorf's *Evangelia Apocrypha, Gesta Pilati Græce*, A. x. 1; B. x. 3, pp. 232, 283.

[4] See *Die ältesten Zeugnisse, u. s. w.*, p. 175.

[5] Tischend. *Evang. Apocrypha*, c. ii. p. 215.

involve the fact that they had seen the document themselves, and it is argued by Scholten that it did not exist in their day; but we incline to the belief of its existence. It is improbable that they would appeal to a mere legend. One thing is clear, that the present 'Hypomnemata' are not what Justin and others allude to.

Eusebius states, that heathen Hypomnemata were fabricated at the time of the Galerian persecution and ordered to be learnt by the school children by command of the Emperor Maximin, but he does not mention our present Acts; nor does he seem to have had any knowledge of them. These anti-Christian Acts composed between the years 307 and 313 are charged with inaccuracies by the historian.[1] Unfortunately they have wholly disappeared.

According to Epiphanius,[2] there were Acts of Pilate in his time to which the Quartodecimans appealed. These could not have been the heathen ones; and therefore the Christian ones existed when he wrote. We are thus led to the interval between Eusebius and Epiphanius (326–376 A.D.) for the origin of our Christian Acts. What the object of them was, may be readily imagined. It was to supplant the heathen document; and to rebut the charges against Christ contained in it by stating that the Roman procurator was convinced, after careful examination, of the innocence of Jesus.

If Justin and Tertullian were really acquainted with early Christian Acts, they are lost long ago. Tischendorf himself makes important admissions relative to the changes in the alleged original document before it took its present form. All that we know of the latter, its character and tendency, leads to the conclusion of its being a fourth-century production, which was composed by some Christian in order to supplant its anti-

[1] *H. E.* ix. 5, 7. Comp. i. 9, 11.
[2] *Hæres.* ii. vol. i. p. 884, ed. Migne.

Christian predecessor. The better to recommend its reception, it pretended to have been originally written in Hebrew by one Nicodemus. It has also passed through various recensions. Doubtless the author used the gospel of John as well as the synoptics; but it is idle to argue from this that the fourth gospel was known at the beginning of the second century.[1]

(*x.*) Theophilus of Antioch (about A.D. 176) is the first who expressly ascribes the gospel to John. In the second book of his treatise addressed to Autolycus, he says: 'Whence the Holy Scriptures teach us and all who carried in them a holy spirit, of whom John says, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God" . . . then he says . . . "the Word was God."'[2]

(*y.*) It is remarkable that a legendary account of the gospel's origin should have come into existence soon after the production itself, suggesting to us the idea of the slow acceptance which the gospel met with. Doubts entertained respecting its apostolic source had to be removed. Hence arose a traditional genesis, which was repeated by the representatives of the catholic Church and commonly believed. That the story of the Johannine origin is unhistorical, at least, in part, is admitted by traditionalists themselves, for it bears on its face the marks of fiction; and we are not careful to claim for it a credibility which it disowns. Any attempt to bring out of it even a nucleus of real history must be conjectural.

It is only necessary to present the legend in some of its forms.

The Muratorian fragment says, that John wrote the gospel at the request of his fellow disciples and bishops, whom he asked to fast and spend three days with him,

[1] See Lipsius's *Die Pilatus-Acten*, and Thilo's *Cod. Apoc. N. T.* Prol. p. cxix.

[2] *Ad Autolycum*, ii. 22.

telling them to relate to one another the revelations received, to whichever of the parties they might be given. A revelation was made to Andrew, in consequence of which John wrote the work in his own name, while all the rest attested it.[1] Thus the origin of the gospel, which was looked over by the apostles before it was made public, is ascribed to a divine revelation. The uncritical mind of the fragmentist is well known, so that he even makes Paul follow the example of his predecessor (?) John in writing to seven churches.

According to Prochorus (about 500 A.D.) the believers in Patmos after much entreaty persuaded John to leave in writing the words he had heard from Christ, and to describe the signs he had seen. Accordingly the apostle, in a standing position, dictated to Prochorus, who sat on the ground and wrote. The brethren were then commanded to make copies for the Churches partly on skins and partly on paper. Some MSS. narrate this of the Revelation not the gospel.[2]

Jerome repeating the account in the Muratorian list say that the brethren forced John to write, which the apostle did after he had fasted. When the fasting was ended, John filled to the full with a revelation, uttered the proem, 'In the beginning was the Word,' etc. etc. It is in the so-called Isidore[3] and Hilary of Poitiers. Epiphanius says that the Holy Spirit forced John, reluctant though he was through fear and humility, to put forth a gospel. Victorinus of Petavium makes all the bishops of the neighbouring provinces come together and compel him to write a testimony against Valentinus, Cerinthus, Ebion, and others. The Vatican MS. of the ninth century already noticed asserts that the gospel was given to the Churches by John 'while he was still in the body,' Papias having written it down at John's

[1] 'Recognoscentibus cunctis.'

[2] See Zahn's *Acta Joannis*, p. 155, etc.

[3] Grynæus, *Monumenta s. patrum orthodoxographa*, part 2.

dictation. The story reaches its climax when Papias is converted into John's amanuensis. The same thing is found in a catena of the Greek fathers on John edited by Corderius; and in Philastrius. The story is also in Theodore of Mopsuestia, Chrysostom, and the enlarged recension of Mellitus published by the monks of Monte Casino.[1] At a later period, even Peter and Paul were brought to Ephesus to request John to write. Eusebius, who gives Clement's account, was also acquainted with the tradition; and the deviations are not without significance.

Zahn tries to show that Leucius Charinus is the first witness in writing, for the tradition.[2] He does not, however, make out this position; and his date of the Leucian Acts of John (before 140 A.D.) is too early. The first written explanation of the gospel's origin cannot be discovered. Whether it appears in the Muratorian canon or the Hypotyposes of Clement is uncertain. If Leucius was the fountain, he would not add to its credibility; for he represents himself as a disciple and companion of John, which is more than doubtful; though Zahn identifies him with the Leucius mentioned by Epiphanius who was associated with John in Asia Minor before the gospel appeared. His docetic christology and sabellianising theology go beyond the gospel's; while his narration of miracles wrought by John parallels the description of those performed by Christ. He is in fact a romancer.

Whichever form of the story be taken as the genuine one or the nearest to genuineness, we believe that it was made for the support of a view which needed credibility because of an existing reluctance to fall in with the Johannine authorship. The requesting or compelling of John by the bishops of Asia Minor and the embassies of churches, either that he might give a deeper theology

[1] See *Bibliotheca Casinensis*, vol. ii. p. 71, vol. iii. p. 38.
[2] *Einleitung in Acta Joannis*, pp. cxxvi–cxxxi.

than that of the synoptists or refute such heretics as Marcion, Cerinthus, and Ebion, with the attribution to him of a higher inspiration than that of the other evangelists, is obviously the invention of partisans for the purpose of recommending a gospel unlike its predecessors—a gospel which was transferred to the last of the apostles only at the close of his life, when strong persuasion overcame his reluctance to write because he had been but a preacher. It is an ecclesiastical myth, not true history.

The *general attestation* which the gospel is said to have received from the company has reference to ch. xxi. 24. As doubts had been expressed respecting its Johannine authorship, external evidence is adduced in its favour; and that evidence proceeded from Andrew, with John's fellow disciples and bishops. The aged apostle is furnished with a diocese and bishops.

The tradition is not abandoned even by good critics, though it is followed absolutely by none. According to Mr. Arnold, the apostle's fellow-disciples who induced John to write were the elders of Ephesus, who got a Greek Christian to redact the materials which John gave them. The gospel is John's because its whole value is in the *logia* or sayings of the Lord. The presbytery of Ephesus provided a redaction for the matter furnished by the aged apostle and published it with their *imprimatur* contained in the words of xix. 35. Such imprimatur satisfied the Asiatic Church. The tradition is thus reproduced in a shape different from its earliest. The apostle himself ceases to be the writer, his fellow-apostles and the neighbouring bishops dwindle down into the presbytery of Ephesus, who employed an unknown Christian to redact the materials; and they like a committee having the censorship of the press, stamp the work with an *imprimatur*. The hypothesis is wholly improbable, chiefly so because the sayings or discourses are so unlike those of Christ in the

synoptics that they cannot be his. Alexandrian theology and theosophy are foreign to one whose teaching was mainly parabolic, and pregnant with moral principles not with metaphysical conceptions of the divine nature. And after all, Mr. Arnold's redactor is thought to have performed his task imperfectly, often setting and expanding the *logia* in a wrong way.[1]

From A.D. 170 onward the gospel is generally referred to as the work of the apostle John. Irenæus, Clement, and Tertullian unmistakably use it as his. The fathers are generally agreed on the point at the end of the second century; and objecting voices are few. The current belief at the beginning of the third century was that the apostle wrote it.

(*z.*) Before entering on the Paschal controversy, which has an important bearing on the authorship of the gospel, it is desirable to place the statements of the four evangelists relating to the paschal supper in a clear light.

The paschal lamb was killed on the 14th day of the month Nisan in the afternoon, and eaten the same evening.

The festival of unleavened bread which the paschal meal ushered in was celebrated seven days, from the 15th to the 21st of Nisan inclusive. In popular and inexact language, the 14th day was sometimes reckoned as the beginning or first day of the festival; so that Josephus could say the festival continued eight days, and Matthew as well as Mark could call the 14th 'the first day of the feast of unleavened bread' (Matt. xxvi. 17; Mark xiv. 12). Christ's last meal with his disciples was the regular and ordinary paschal supper of the Jews, on the evening of the 14th of Nisan. Mark says, 'on the first day of unleavened bread, when *they killed the passover*' (xiv. 12); and Luke's language is still more explicit, 'then came the day of unleavened bread, when

[1] See *God and the Bible*, pp. 256, 257.

the passover *must be killed*,' according to law (xxii. 7). The synoptists intend to say that Jesus partook of the legal passover-meal on the evening of the 14th of Nisan. He was therefore crucified on the 15th.

When we turn to the fourth gospel the statements are different. In xviii. 28, we read, 'And they themselves [the Jews] went not into the judgment-hall, lest they should be defiled, *but that they might eat the passover*.' This implies that when Jesus was brought before Pilate, the paschal supper of the Jews, of which they were to partake on the ensuing evening, was still future. The gospel makes the 14th of Nisan the day when Jesus was given up to crucifixion by Pilate, instead of placing his trial in the morning of the 15th. There is thus a day's difference between the synoptists and John.

Again, in xix. 14, we read, 'it was the preparation of the passover,' viz. the 14th of Nisan, on which Jesus suffered.

Lastly, in xix. 31, it is stated, 'for that sabbath-day was a high day.' Here the sabbath beginning with the evening of the crucifixion day, is called 'a great day,'[1] because it coincided with the first day of the festival or the 15th of Nisan. Thus Jesus was crucified on the 14th.

A comparison of the synoptists with the fourth gospel, as here represented, shows that they disagree with respect to a day, the former putting the paschal feast on the 14th of Nisan, and the crucifixion on the 15th; the latter, the crucifixion on the 14th. Had John described the paschal supper, he would have placed it on the 13th of Nisan.

The synoptical 'preparation-day' is not 'the preparation' of the fourth gospel (xix. 14, 31, 42), but 'the preparation for the sabbath,' or Friday (Mark xv. 42; Luke xxiii. 54). John's 'preparation of the pass-

[1] μεγάλη ἡμέρα.

over' is the 14th Nisan, the day of the passover according to this gospel, equivalent to *the eve of the passover*[1] as used by the Jews. The writer might have said *passover day*, but he uses ambiguous language instead. The phrase *preparation of the passover* does not mean the Friday in passover week or passover Friday, as Wieseler takes it, for the construction is against it, as is also the peculiar phraseology of the gospel. Holtzmann has shown that later patristic usage cannot be accepted in proof of such meaning.[2] As the first day of the feast was a solemn day, and is even called a *sabbath*, the 14th of Nisan was the preparation for such passover-extraordinary sabbath, not for the usual weekly one. The synoptists speak of the *weekly*, John of the *feast* preparation.

The best critics admit that there is an irreconcilable difference between the synoptics and the fourth gospel, in respect to the day on which Jesus was crucified. Bleek himself, who believes in the authenticity of John's gospel, has dispelled the apologetic reconcilements of Wieseler, Tholuck, Hengstenberg, and others. The synoptics have Jewish authority in their favour ;[3] and therefore the 14th of Nisan, on which the fourth gospel makes Jesus to have been crucified, is not the proper legal day. This implies that the work was not written by an eyewitness of the transactions connected with the death of Jesus.

The only way of evading the conclusion is that adopted by Holtzmann, viz. to assume that the synoptic account is improbable in itself and inconsistent with the Talmud. But in order to introduce doubts into the synoptic relation, it is necessary to take for granted a formal or official trial of Jesus by the Sanhedrim, which cannot be allowed, because the meeting did not take

[1] עֶרֶב הַפֶּסַח.

[2] In Bunsen's *Bibelwerk*, achter Band, zweite Abtheilung, p. 310.

[3] Philo, *Vita Mosis*, § 30; Josephus, *Antiq.* book iii. c. x. 5, 6.

place in the temple, but in the house of the high-priest (Mark xiv. 53, 54; Luke xxii. 54); and because the sanhedrists were not already assembled at the high-priest's, waiting till the prisoner should be brought in, as Matthew represents, but came along with those who had apprehended Jesus, and with the prisoner himself, into the house of the high-priest, according to Mark's statement.[1] The whole process was hastily conducted; and Christ was condemned by Pilate, merely in consequence of the high-priest's counsel. The later Rabbins are not sufficient authority to set aside the evangelists and their sources, because the latter were so near the time, and must have known the circumstances better. The whole attempt to damage the synoptists, in order to save the credit of John on this point, is a failure;[2] so that Holtzmann, with the aid of many others, has not succeeded in making the Johannine account override the other.[3]

Eusebius states that when the blessed Polycarp went to Rome in the time of Anicetus, and they had a little difference among themselves, they were soon reconciled. 'For neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp not to observe it [the Jewish passover], because he had always observed it with John, the disciple of our Lord, and the rest of the apostles with whom he associated; and neither did Polycarp persuade Anicetus to observe, who said that he was bound to maintain the practice of the presbyters before him. Which things being so, they communed with each other; and in the church Anicetus yielded to Polycarp, out of respect, no doubt, to the office of consecrating; and they separated from each other in peace, all the church being at peace; both those who observed, and those who did not observe,

[1] ἀπήγαγον τὸν Ἰησοῦν πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα καὶ συνέρχονται αὐτῷ (τῷ Ἰησοῦ) πάντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς.—Mark xiv. 53.

[2] See Scholten's *Das Evang. nach Johannes*, § 23, p. 282, *et seq.*

[3] In Bunsen's *Bibelwerk*, achter Band, p. 316, *et seq.*

maintaining peace.' This was a friendly conference, rather than a dispute between the bishops of Smyrna and Rome, about A.D. 162.[1]

The difference of opinion between Polycarp and Anicetus became an open dispute soon after. Melito bishop of Sardis wrote a work on the passover, whose commencement is given by Eusebius thus: 'When Servilius Paulus was proconsul of Asia, at which time Sagaris suffered martyrdom, there was much discussion in Laodicea respecting the passover which occurred at the right time in those days,' etc.[2] Clement of Alexandria took occasion to write a book on the passover also, in which he held a different view from that of Melito who was of the same opinion with the church of Asia Minor generally, and with Apollinaris bishop of Hierapolis who wrote on the subject (A.D. 170); a few extracts of whose book have been preserved in the 'Paschal Chronicle.'

'There are some who through ignorance quarrel about these things, being affected in a way that should be pardoned; for ignorance ought not to be followed by accusation, but it stands in need of instruction. And they say that the Lord ate the sheep with his disciples on the 14th, and that he himself suffered on the great day of unleavened bread; and they relate that Matthew says exactly as they have understood the matter to be; whence their understanding of it does not harmonise with the law; and the gospels, according to them, seem to differ.'

Another fragment of Apollinaris, in the same Chronicle, states: 'The 14th is the true passover of the Lord, the great sacrifice, the Son of God in place of the lamb, who, though bound himself, bound the strong one, and who, being judge of the living and the dead, was judged; was delivered into the hands of sinners to be crucified; he who was exalted upon horns

[1] *Hist. Eccles.* v. 24. [2] *Ibid.* iv. 26.

of the unicorn; whose sacred side was pierced; that poured forth from his side two things which purify again, water and blood, word and spirit, and who was buried on the day of the passover, a stone having been put upon his sepulchre.'[1]

The dispute did not end with Melito of Sardis and Apollinaris. Instead of being confined to Asia Minor, it afterwards extended to the West; and the church of Rome in particular appeared against the Oriental ones. Polycrates bishop of Ephesus (A.D. 190) addressed a letter to Victor of Rome, fragments of which are preserved in Eusebius.

'We therefore observe the genuine day, neither adding thereto nor taking therefrom. For in Asia great lights have fallen asleep, which shall rise again in the day of the Lord's appearing, in which he will come with glory from heaven, and will raise up all the saints; Philip, one of the twelve apostles, who sleeps in Hierapolis, and his two aged virgin daughters. His other daughter also, who having lived under the influence of the Holy Ghost, now likewise rests in Ephesus. Moreover, John, who rested upon the bosom of our Lord, who also was a priest, and bore the sacerdotal plate, both a martyr and teacher. He is buried in Ephesus; also Polycarp of Smyrna, both bishop and martyr. Thraseus also, bishop and martyr of Eumenia, who is buried at Smyrna. Why should I mention Sagaris, bishop and martyr, who rests at Laodicea? Moreover, the blessed Papirius, and Melito, the eunuch, etc. . . . . All these observed the 14th day of the passover, according to the gospel, deviating in no respect, but following the rule of faith. Moreover, I Polycrates, who am the least of all of you, according to the tradition of my relatives, some of whom I have followed. For there were seven of my relatives bishops, and I am the eighth; and my rela-

[1] *Chron. Pasch.* p. 6, ed. Dindorf.

tives always observed the day when the people (the Jews) threw away the leaven. I therefore, brethren, am now sixty-five years in the Lord, who having conferred with the brethren throughout the world, and having studied the whole of the sacred Scriptures, am not at all alarmed at those things with which I am threatened to be intimidated. For they who are greater than I have said, "We ought to obey God rather than men."'[1]

The course of the dispute need not be followed farther. It continued till the council of Nicæa, when it was settled in favour of the Roman usage.

This passover-controversy turned upon the day to which the memory of the last supper that Jesus ate with his disciples should be attached. The Christians of Asia Minor kept the paschal feast on the 14th of Nisan, the same day in which Christ ate the lamb according to the synoptic gospels; for which they appealed to apostolic tradition and the example of John himself. The fourth gospel is opposed to their view, for it puts the crucifixion of Jesus on the 14th, so that his last meal with the disciples must have been on the 13th. The Roman church and most others, holding Jesus to be the paschal lamb himself, maintained that he died on the 14th, so that they saw no reason for ceasing to fast on that day, but continued to do so till Sunday, the day of the resurrection, which they kept as a yearly feast. Uniting the ideas of a *crucifixion-* and *resurrection-passover*,[2] but giving decided preponderance to the latter, Easter Sunday, the day of his resurrection, became to the Western church an unvarying memorial of redemption. Those who observed the 14th of Nisan and were called Quartodecimans, believed that they ought to do what Jesus did, that is, to partake of a meal and not to fast; so that their commemorative act

[1] *H. E.* v. 24.

[2] A *πάσχα σταυρώσιμον* and a *πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον*.

naturally closed the ordinary fast preceding Easter. Their remembrance of Christ centred in the few hours which he spent with his disciples just before his sufferings. The passover meal was to them the melancholy reminder of the Master as he entered upon his passion.

It is equally strange that the Roman church did not appeal to the fourth gospel, which is on their side; as that the Asiatics adduced the apostle's practice for a custom to which the gospel is adverse. And it is difficult to see how the Asiatic Christians could have been unacquainted with John's practice. The gospel was in existence A.D. 160 and earlier. We do not read that Anicetus appealed to it to show Polycarp his error; the latter appealed to John's own practice against the view taken in the gospel. Three suppositions are possible. 1st. That the Christians of Asia Minor or the Quartodecimans did not know of the gospel; 2ndly. That knowing it, they did not acknowledge it as John's; or, 3rdly. That knowing it to be the apostle's, they saw no discrepancy between it and the practice they advocated. The second of these is the most probable. It has been said indeed, that John himself considered the matter to be of little importance, and conformed to a practice which he found already existing in Ephesus. The apostle knew that the last meal which Jesus partook of with his disciples was on the 14th of Nisan, and that the crucifixion happened on the 15th. If that be so, how could he set forth in the gospel, that Jesus himself being the paschal lamb suffered on the 14th? As long as the day was the point that regulated the whole question, and the memory of the last supper the thing to be perpetuated, the apostle could not but keep the feast on the 14th. He would doubtless feel with the Quartodecimans, whom Hippolytus represents as saying, 'Christ celebrated the passover on that very day (the 14th); I therefore must also do as the Lord did.' That feeling

and the practice to which it led was Judaistic; while the 19th chapter of the fourth gospel shows the writer's view to have been that the new religion was absolutely severed from the old. The apostle Paul appears to have been the first who conceived of Christ as the true Christian passover (1 Cor. v. 7), sacrificed for sinners; and this great idea penetrated the minds of the Gentile Christians, dissociating them from the type and attaching them to the substance. The view of the fourth gospel is the same.

The contest between the two parties was not the conflict of one tradition with another, but that of a doctrinal idea with a settled tradition. It turned upon the *observance* or *non-observance*[1] *of the 14th day*; the Quartodecimans or Jewish Christians holding that the memory of the last meal should be observed on the 14th, and affirming it had been so from the beginning; their opponents, without denying the fact, maintaining that the *passion* excluded the *participation*;[2] that Christ being the paschal lamb he must have died on the day the lamb was slain; and therefore his last meal with the disciples was not on that day.

If the fourth gospel was ignored, as far as we know, in the friendly debate between Polycarp and Anicetus, it was not so by Apollinaris, who took an opposite view to that of the Quartodecimans. Their opinion, he says, makes the gospels apparently *differ*,[3] i.e. the fourth from Matthew's. He also intimates, that they interpreted Matthew's gospel as being on their side. Apollinaris himself, with the western Christians generally, combining the typical lamb and its antitype, ignored the paschal supper, making the 13th of Nisan correspond to the Quartodeciman 14th so far as it was a memorial of Christ's last meal with his disciples.

[1] τηρεῖν or μὴ τηρεῖν.

[2] The παθεῖν the φαγεῖν: τὸ δὲ πάσχα οὐκ ἔφαγεν, ἀλλ' ἔπαθεν, as Hippolytus says; *Chron. Pasch.* p. 13, ed. Dindorf; or in Hippolytus's works by Delagarde, p. 92.

[3] στασιάζειν.

A passage similar to the first already given from Apollinaris, is found in Hippolytus viii. 18, where the Quartodecimans are referred to as *certain persons*,[1] litigious by nature, etc. The little word *some*[2] in Apollinaris, and the corresponding *some*[3] in Hippolytus, have been curiously applied by Steitz, serving to uphold a fancied heretical or Ebionite Quartodeciman party. How could a writer, it is asked, venture to call a whole party *some*? They must have formed, says Donaldson, an utterly overwhelming majority in Asia Minor. But it is consistent with the usage of the word to take it otherwise than a mere expression of quantity. Whatever party, large or small, is singled out for prominence either in a good or bad sense, may be so designated. Thus Eusebius speaking of the epistle to the Hebrews being regarded as unapostolic by the Roman church, says, that it was so[4] *among some of the Romans*,[5] though the Church generally esteemed it so. The *custom of the Latins*,[6] as Jerome phrases it, is in the church historian, '*some* of the Romans.' In like manner, the apostle Paul styles his opponents, however numerous or considerable, *some*[7] (Gal. i. 7; 1 Cor. iv. 18; 2 Cor. iii. 1; Rom. iii. 8). The Muratorian fragment applies *some*[8] in the same way about the reading of the *Apocalypse of Peter* in the churches. In short, the expression is a most convenient one, when a writer wishes to avoid specific mention of persons from whom he differs, be they many or few. But in the time of Apollinaris the Western and Alexandrian churches constituted an overwhelming majority against the Quartodecimans.

The second fragment quoted from Apollinaris, shows how he fully coincided with the view of the fourth gospel, and took his stand upon that basis in combating the Quartodecimans. Yet after his death, when Poly-

[1] τινές.
[2] ἔνιοι.
[3] τινές.
[4] παρὰ Ῥωμαίων τισίν.
[5] *Eccles. Hist.* vi. 20.
[6] 'Consuetudo Latinorum.'
[7] τινές.
[8] 'Quidam.'

crates wrote (A.D. 190), the Christians of Asia Minor appealed to John the apostle as one who observed the 14th day of Nisan according to the evangelical history.[1] Is not the inference plain, either that these Christians did not know of the fourth gospel, which is unlikely; or that they did not look upon it as John's; or that they did not perceive its discrepancy with their own practice and with the synoptics? The last supposition is as improbable as the first; for controversy sharpens men's wits, causing them to see what they might otherwise overlook.

Let the thing kept by the Asiatics be clearly observed. It was the 14th of Nisan. And in what did the keeping consist? In the feast of the passover of salvation, i.e. a communion commemorating Christ's last paschal meal. This follows from Eusebius's statement. 'The churches of all Asia, guided by a remoter tradition, supposed that they ought to keep the 14th day of the moon on the occasion of the feast of the Saviour's passover, on which day the Jews had been commanded to kill the paschal lamb.'[2] Thus the 14th of Nisan was observed as a feast day by the celebration of a supper in the evening. The Asiatics, preserving primitive tradition, paid chief attention to the paschal meal, which they commemorated by a similar one; whereas the Westerns, disregarding the 14th of Nisan, celebrated the mystery of the resurrection on Sunday. They differed not about keeping the 14th of Nisan as a fast in memory of the death of Jesus, but about the observance of it as a commemorative feast-day. The view of Neander and Ewald, who allege that the 14th day was kept *as a fast*, is opposed to the words of Polycrates in Eusebius. The main point was, not the day on which a fast should

[1] κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.

[2] τῆς Ἀσίας ἁπάσης αἱ παροικίαι ὡς ἐκ παραδόσεως ἀρχαιοτέρας, σελήνης τὴν τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτην ᾤοντο δεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ σωτηρίου πάσχα ἑορτῆς παραφυλάττειν, ἐν ᾗ θύειν τὸ πρόβατον Ἰουδαίοις προηγορεύετο.—v. 23.

close, but the observance of it as characterised by a paschal supper. The Westerns, true to their conviction that Christ himself was the paschal lamb sacrificed on the 14th of Nisan, believed that no commemorative feast could be observed on it, and disregarding the day fasted till Sunday morning; while the Jewish Christians, who held that Jesus suffered on the 15th of Nisan, kept a memorial supper similar to the passover one on the 14th. The one acted in the spirit of a catholic, the other, of a Jewish Christianity. The one followed the earliest and Judaic practice; the other, a practice developed out of the primitive by that liberalising tendency which converted the Ebionite type into one adapted to humanity at large.

It is remarkable that Neander[1] should misunderstand Polycrates's language respecting his predecessors: 'all kept the day of the 14th of the passover, according to the gospel.' The meaning is plain, that the Christians of Asia Minor celebrated the memory of the last meal which Jesus held with his disciples, on the 14th of Nisan, when the Jews removed leaven from their houses. When Polycrates says that all these (including John the apostle) observed the fourteenth day of the passover *according to the gospel*, he means the gospel history in Matthew, Mark, and Luke. The phrase does not include John's, not only for the reason that Polycrates would hardly write of John keeping the passover according to his own gospel, but because that gospel does not speak of the time of keeping it. When the writer also appeals to *all holy Scripture*,[2] he evidently refers to the Old Testament as his voucher for the opinion that the paschal lamb was slain on the fourteenth. It is incorrect to say with Meyer, that no disagreement was noticed then between the gospels with respect to the day of Christ's death; for Apollinaris thought that the

[1] *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, vol. i. p. 406. Clark's English translation.

[2] πᾶσα ἁγία γραφή.

Quartodeciman view made the gospels differ from each other[1] in regard to Jesus eating the sheep with his disciples on the fourteenth day, *and consequently* in regard to the day of his death. It is equally incorrect to assert that the synoptics were supposed at that time to describe an *anticipative* passover, a day earlier than the regular paschal supper was eaten; the hypothesis is a modern one. The natural interpretation of Polycrates's words is, that he and those before him in Asia Minor, who had been familiar with John and others, appealed to the apostle's practice, in opposition to the usage of the Roman and other Western churches who did not observe the 14th of Nisan as the anniversary of Christ's last supper; and the fact of their not appealing to John's gospel implies that it was against them, or that they did not acknowledge its authority because they perceived its discrepancy with Matthew's. We learn from Apollinaris that they appealed to Matthew;[2] if they reckoned John's authentic and on their side, why did they not appeal to *it*?

When Meyer infers that Polycrates's testimony is in harmony with the conclusion that the four gospels were acknowledged to agree respecting the day of Christ's death and the eating of the passover supper, he virtually makes the contending parties quarrel about nothing. If all were united in relation to the fourteenth day as that of Christ's crucifixion, what was the ground of their controversy? A small Ebionite or Judaising part of the Quartodecimans is made to appear for the purpose of furnishing the occasion of dispute. The reason for this invention of Weitzel's which Meyer and Ebrard have caught at is apparent.

Bleek has also tried to account for the fact that John might have kept the 14th day of Nisan, like the Asiatic Christians generally, in perfect consistency with his authorship of the fourth gospel; and De Wette agrees

[1] στασιάζειν. [2] διηγοῦνται Ματθαῖον οὕτω λέγειν.

with him. His solution of the question is, that the dispute had no reference at first to a difference of days in which the memory of the suffering and resurrection of the Lord should be preserved; but that it referred simply to the Asiatics celebrating something on the 14th of Nisan which the Westerns did not and thought they ought not to observe, else the opposition between the parties would not have been characterised simply as a *keeping* and *not keeping*; *those who kept* and *those who did not keep*,[1] as it is in Irenæus's account of the conference between Polycarp and Anicetus; Polycrates expressing it more fully as *a keeping of the fourteenth day in the passover*-(week).[2]

This is an erroneous view of the question. The object of the Christian passover at first was not to commemorate the sufferings and death of Jesus, but the last supper with his disciples. The remembrance of this meal and the Lord's supper connected with it, was generally kept in the Church; but the difference was, that the one party kept it in the form of the Jewish passover, the other not. Hence it cannot be rightly affirmed that the Westerns did not keep at all what the Asiatics kept. It is also said by Bleek, that the observance of the fourteenth day arose from the fact that the believing Jews took part in the passover of their people. The church at Jerusalem joined in the passover-celebration and in the passover-supper at the legally appointed time, without respect to the circumstance of the disciples partaking of the last supper with Jesus on that day or the preceding evening. So it is said. But the first Christians did not celebrate the feast as Jews, but as Jewish Christians. Whatever Jewish form their passover-keeping may have had, it must have been of a true Christian character. Their object was to keep a memorial of the last supper of Jesus with his disciples, which he had

[1] τηρεῖν and μὴ τηρεῖν, οἱ τηροῦντες and οἱ μὴ τηροῦντες.
[2] τηρεῖν τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτης τοῦ πάσχα.

held in the form of the paschal supper and on the legal day. Hence this Christian passover could be kept on no other day than the 14th of Nisan.

In consistency with his view of the Christians celebrating the passover as a Jewish festival along with the Jews, Bleek affirms that there was nothing peculiar in the apostle John keeping the paschal feast while he abode at Ephesus, as he had observed it before at Jerusalem in the legal way, especially as Jewish Christians were the majority in the church of Ephesus, just as the apostle Paul himself would have done in similar circumstances. This is a false view of the matter. The passover-supper was not regarded by Jewish Christians as the bare passover, but as one identical with Jesus's last supper. Hence the apostle John could observe it in no other way if he observed it along with the Asiatics, than with the intent of its commemorating the last supper.

As long as critics do not keep in view the fact that the 14th of Nisan is the criterion for determining the position of the contending parties ; that the *observance* or *non-observance*[1] of a memorial supper on that day was the point of dispute ; they will fail to understand it.

Some cast suspicion on the fragments of Apollinaris, or argue against their authenticity. Neander and the author of 'Supernatural Religion' do so, adducing the fact that no such work is mentioned in the ancient lists of the writings of Apollinaris given by Eusebius, Jerome, and Photius ; and that it would be singular if the usage of the church in Asia Minor were not followed in the district where he wrote. Eusebius, though he mentions no treatise of Apollinaris's on the passover, speaks of *several works of his preserved by many*, and only of such as had reached him. He could not describe or speak of what he did not know. What he says of Apollinaris as the opponent of the Montanists, agrees with his

[1] τηρεῖν and μὴ τηρεῖν.

theological point of view in the paschal controversy. And the usage of the Asiatic church with regard to Easter, need not necessarily have been universal when the Phrygian bishop wrote. He, and probably others, dissented from the opinion of the majority.

The observations of Dr. James Donaldson about the Apollinarian fragments are misleading when he says 'it may be doubted whether it was a practical controversy at all. It seems more of the nature of a discussion; it was a wrangling, at the bottom of which was ignorance, not difference of practice.'[1] From the first appearance of the dispute under Anicetus, till its reappearance in the days of Victor, there was an interval of nearly half a century. Each time it broke out the symptoms and language used are the same; so that it is scarcely possible not to recognise its identity and continuity. The duration of the dispute shows that it was not unimportant. So far from its being a matter of little moment, it was thought to affect the essential significance of Christianity, its relation to Judaism, the total abolition of type and shadow by the reality, the substance and independence of the new religion. It arose out of the Christian consciousness of the time. It gave rise to many protests and remonstrances, to synods and controversial writings. It elicited the impressive appeal of Polycrates, and the severities of Victor. And however Irenæus, in the interests of catholic unity, might deprecate Victor's extreme coercive measures, the long-protracted controversy and the documentary evidence on the subject prove that the parties did not think it trivial. The anti-Quartodecimans felt that if Jesus were not crucified at the time the paschal lamb was slain, there would be a discrepancy between type and antitype. But if, dying on the very day of the legal sacrifice, he was himself the true lamb, he abolished the Jewish passover in his

[1] *History of Christian Literature and Doctrine*, vol. iii. p. 245.

own person; substance displaced shadow; the accomplishment, the type; and Apollinaris could properly reprove the Asiatic communities for their deficieney in that 'knowledge' or insight into the original meaning of Judaic symbolism revealed in Christianity, in which, as explained by Barnabas, the essence of Christian speculation consisted. The typical signification of Judaism being fulfilled, as shown in the 19th chapter of John, the new religion became absolutely independent of the old. It was therefore no longer needful to observe the legal day of the passover. The Eastern observance was entirely annulled.

It is unnecessary for our present purpose to enter on a discussion of the views propounded by Weitzel and Steitz, because Hilgenfeld has shown their untenableness.[1] Presenting as they do a plausible handle to apologists, they have been gladly accepted by such; but it is only necessary to look at the early notices of the paschal controversy to ensure the rejection of distorted inferences drawn from them. The assumption of a twofold Quartodecimanism, one heretical, is as gratuitous as that which represents the Quartodeciman festival as a commemoration of Christ's death. In the latter case, the sole difference between the churches would be a mere matter of discipline and ritual, a varying limit of fasting and feasting, one party observing the memory of the crucifixion on the 14th of Nisan, the other, the resurrection on Easter Sunday. The fragments of Hippolytus and Apollinaris distinctly state that the subject of Quartodeciman commemoration was not the death of Christ. Hence the discrepancy between the Quartodeciman custom and the fourth gospel remains.

The substance of this argument may be stated briefly. *Quartodecimanism*, that is, the celebration of the legal passover on the 14th Nisan transformed into Christ's final meal with his disciples, and commemorated

[1] *Der Paschastreit der alten Kirche*, 1860.

as such by the Jewish Christians of Asia according to the synoptic gospels, was adopted by the apostle John; for the Quartodecimans appealed to him in favour of their practice, as we learn from Polycarp, who visited Rome A.D. 155; and to the evangelist Matthew, as we learn from Apollinaris of Hierapolis. On the other hand, the *anti-Quartodecimans*, who made the death of Christ and the passover coincide because they held that death to be the true passover, appealed to the fourth gospel for the fact that he suffered on the 14th Nisan, as we learn from Apollinaris. This gospel puts the parting meal of Jesus a day before the legal passover day (xiii. 1, 2, 29; xviii. 28; xix. 14, 31), and goes directly against the Quartodeciman practice. As the apostle John was a Quartodeciman and his alleged gospel the opposite, he could not have written it.

(*aa.*) The Alogi, a sarcastic *double-entendre* name given by Epiphanius to those of whom he speaks, rejected John's writings, i.e. the gospel and Apocalypse, assigning them to Cerinthus. The reasons for this, as far as we can gather them from Epiphanius, were, that the gospel does not agree with the synoptics in several instances. They seem to have felt the difficulties inherent in a comparison of the fourth with the other three. Viewing the gospel as a book but partially received as authentic, and needing examination before acceptance, they hesitated to admit it, especially as it was not up to their time in undisputed possession of apostolic authority nor a part of the tradition of the church. Rejecting the Logos in the gospel, they were orthodox in the main, according to the testimony of Epiphanius himself. But they were not the only persons of their time who refused to admit the gospel. 'They belonged,' says Dr. v. Döllinger, 'to a circle in which the fourth gospel down to the time of the outbreak of the Montanist movement had found no admittance.'[1] If their

[1] *Hippolytus and Callistus*, translated by A. Plummer, p. 287.

opposition was doctrinal, it was not irrational on that account. If it arose from the application of the term Logos to Jesus, their ground was tenable. At any rate, they were not 'a few eccentric individuals.'

(*bb.*) Another fact bears on the question. In the early Christian age it was believed that Christ's ministry lasted only a year. This opinion kept its ground even after the fourth gospel was recognised as apostolic, showing its rooted antiquity. Clement of Alexandria had it. So had Origen, who says that the ministry lasted a year and some months. Julius Africanus and Lactantius thought so too. If the fourth gospel were early received as John's, it is difficult to conceive how this view could have taken hold of Christian antiquity; for the work presents insuperable obstacles to it, by *naming three* passovers and perhaps a fourth. The fact is adverse to the apostolic origin of the gospel. That Clement, Origen, and others holding the one year's ministry and yet accepting John's gospel as authentic, justifies the idea of earlier writers doing the same—equally accepting all the four as if they could be harmonised on the point—is inconsequential, because *the element of time* constitutes an important distinction. The acceptance of the one year's ministry and of the apostolic origin of the fourth gospel in Origen's time is very different from their acceptance in the year A.D. 150. When Clement and Origen flourished, the Johannine origin of the gospel was so firmly established that it would have been vain to reject it because of its disagreement with the one year's ministry. The fact that they believed both, showed the deep root which the latter had taken at an early period. That much earlier writers did so is doubtful. The one year's ministry was an early opinion founded on the first three gospels; the authenticity of the fourth gospel was not believed in as early or considered to be consistent with it.[1]

[1] Mr. Browne, in his *Ordo Sæculorum*, is the ablest upholder of the one

The series of testimonies need not be followed farther by mentioning the Peshito, which translation belongs to the *first* part of the third century, because it uses the Curetonian Syriac of the gospels, made at the close of the second century. The old Latin version or versions of Northern Africa used by Tertullian, in whose time they were current (A.D. 190), cannot be put earlier than 160. Hence Tischendorf is incorrect in saying that 'soon after and even about the middle of the second century, the four gospels had been translated together into Latin as well as Syriac.' It is impossible to show that the four were current as early as A.D. 150, much less that they were translated at that time or even ten years later. Can it be done by appealing to vague expressions, such as 'the elders,' whom Papias took for his authorities? Not till we know what they were, when they lived, and the credit due to their supposed statement. When therefore an important testimony for the existence of the fourth gospel at the end of the apostolic period is founded on a passage in Irenæus, 'And on this account they (the elders) say the Lord gave expression to the statement, "In my Father's house are many mansions" (John xiv. 2),[1] it is precarious to infer with Tischendorf and others[2] either that Irenæus derived his account of the presbyters from Papias's work, or that the authority of the elders carries us back to the termination of the apostolic time. The word *elders* is sometimes defined by 'disciples of the apostles,' sometimes by 'who saw John the disciple of the Lord.'[3] Is it not evident that Irenæus employed it loosely, without an exact idea of the persons he meant?

Irenæus (A.D. 190) accepted the authenticity of the

year's ministry in modern times. But the point is too uncertain to admit of even a probable solution on the ground of *the four* canonical gospels.

[1] *Adv. Hæres.* v. 36.

[2] *Wann wurden die Evangelien? u. s. w.*, pp. 119, 120, 4th ed.

[3] Comp. *Irenæus*, iii. 36, 1.

gospel. The testimony of this father is thought to be weighty, because of his early relation to the church of Asia Minor and to Polycarp. It should be noticed, however, that he does not appeal to Polycarp as a voucher for the Johannine authorship of the gospel; nor to any disciple of John. He appeals to them for traditions about the person of Christ, for apocryphal sayings of Christ which they preserved, for the meaning of a passage in the Apocalypse (v. 36); but the gospel is not mentioned. The relation of Irenæus to Polycarp and the church of Asia Minor does not seem to have been intimate. He was only a boy when he listened to Polycarp's sayings relative to Christ, which were taken from apostolic tradition. If he had not arrived at man's age before he left Asia Minor, as is highly probable, the intimacy between them did not prevent Irenæus's acceptance of the fourth gospel as apostolic, though unattested by Polycarp John's disciple. The youthful curiosity of the boy had been excited and gratified by the old man's recitals, whose substance could not be correctly retained, even if truly reported, in the memory of a man not distinguished for mental power. We know that Irenæus *did* commit mistakes about John's writings. Thus he appeals to the testimony of the elders in Asia Minor as well as to John's gospel (viii. 56), to show that Jesus was between forty and fifty years of age when he entered on his public ministry.[1] He also relates a fabulous saying of Christ respecting the vines in Paradise, for which he expressly appeals both to the tradition of the elders who heard it from John, and to Papias's written testimony.[2] He confounded his own notions and inferences with facts. Even where he mentions his witnesses, he is far from reliable. How then can we confide in him when the witnesses are not given? The weight of his testimony is certainly not enhanced by his alleged con-

[1] *Adv. Hæres.* ii. 22, 4. [2] *Ibid.* v. 33, 3.

nection with John through Polycarp, for he was not a proper *disciple* of the latter, and is silent about hearing from him that John wrote a gospel.[1] The link between him and John will not bear tension when applied to unite his testimony with the apostolic authorship of the fourth gospel, but thins into feebleness.

Since Apollinaris testifies to the gospel's existence in his time, while Theophilus of Antioch refers it to John, it must have come into general use A.D. 175–180. But it was written before that time, for Tatian's Apology shows that it existed between A.D. 165 and 175. Justin Martyr was unacquainted with it, and so was Papias. Polycarp's epistle does not use it. Hence we date it about A.D. 150; not much earlier because of Justin Martyr's and other testimonies. Keim's date is about A.D. 130, and Hilgenfeld's soon after, A.D. 132, the latter guided by the words of v. 43: 'if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive,' which are referred to Barkochba, a Jewish antichrist as he is called. The conjecture is ingenious but improbable, though Hilgenfeld thinks it confirmed by the idea of a Jewish antichrist in Irenæus and Hippolytus.

Although the gospel came into use after A.D. 150, being generally accepted as John's from that time, some had still doubts of its authenticity, as we infer from the Muratorian list, Irenæus, Hippolytus's treatise in its defence, as also from Epiphanius and Philastrius. It was rejected in the circle to which the Alogi belonged, and that consisted of catholic Christians. It was not therefore canonised without contradiction. But it was welcomed by those who were intent upon the formation of a catholic Church based on a common doctrine, and excluding the objectionable elements of gnosticism while absorbing the better ones with which a later Paulinism could easily unite.

The offhand reasoning of modern traditionalists,

[1] See the *Theological Review* for July 1870, p. 300, etc.

viz. that the gospel *must have been received* by the founders of the Gnostic sects from the beginning, and if so, by the catholic Christians at the same time, so that it was generally adopted both by Gnostics and their opponents between the years 120 and 130, is fallacious.[1] Adequate proof that the gospel was received by the founders of the sects or by catholic Christians at the same time, is wanting. The testimony of Hippolytus and other fathers of the church fails to attest the assumption.

Much stress is laid upon the alleged fact that our present gospels were received as genuine and sacred books in the last quarter of the second century by the great body of Christians; and it is thence inferred that they must have been in existence long before. This argument, however, though meant to strengthen the Johannine origin of the fourth, is not so powerful as its enthusiastic supporters suppose. And it is pushed too far when it is said, that *none others* were received as authoritative at that time. The great body of Christians were uncritical, dependent on a few prominent teachers, such as Irenæus, Justin, and Tertullian, who were not themselves discerning. When the Gnostics flourished, and others who fell back on tradition were alarmed, the leading minds among the latter hastened to contract the number of writings in circulation and to make a canon of appeal. The fourth gospel was from its very nature welcomed and accepted by zealous catholics as an antidote to heretical Gnosticism as well as a theological biography fitted to attract Gentile thought. We submit, that twenty or twenty-five years were sufficient in the circumstances of the time to account for its ready reception by the advocates of tradition in their haste to make up a canon. That the four and *none others* were then adopted, there is no evidence to show, any more than that their reception was *universal*. The con-

[1] Abbot, *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 88, 89.

trary is true. Hegesippus soon after Justin (A.D. 170–175) did not employ the four gospels as authoritative, but rather that according to the Hebrews. Serapion of Antioch (about 190) found the gospel of Peter, which was probably identical with that of the Hebrews, in circulation at Rhossus. This gospel of the Hebrews, not the same certainly with any of the canonical ones, was used in the last quarter of the second century and long after by the Jewish Christians who were the legitimate representatives of primitive Christianity. That century with its gradually growing catholicism could not suppress at once the gospels already in circulation. Besides, the legend about John being persuaded or forced by fellow apostles and Asiatic bishops to write a gospel, indicates that the production in question had not been received universally in the last half of the second century. The idea of sacredness or infallibility attaching to the four canonical ones, arose during the Gnostic heresies, and was not stamped upon them as soon as they appeared. A few assumed it towards the end of the second century, and the multitude followed. On this point Mr. Norton's broad generalisations are misleading; and his follower Dr. E. Abbot with one-sided eagerness pushes them to excess. Because the four gospels were commonly received by Irenæus and other fathers as authentic and authoritative, it does not follow that the fourth was written long before, that is, prior to A.D. 150; much less that it was John's production.[1]

2. Internal evidence.

The earliest proof of the gospel's authenticity some find in the 21st chapter, which is an appendix by another hand. There would be weight in this if we knew when or by whom the chapter was written. It is remarkable that Irenæus never uses it. He speaks

[1] See Norton's *Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels*, vol. i.; and Abbot's *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*.

of the long life of John lasting till the time of Trajan, but does not appear to have been acquainted with the saying about the apostle's continuance till the return of Christ. Though he attached great importance to the authenticity of the gospel, he does not allude to this testimony in favour of it. When he mentions the circle of John's disciples and the traditions current in it, he has no reference to the oldest traditions of the present chapter. He was ignorant of the third manifestation of Jesus recorded in the appendix, for he speaks of those in the 20th chapter only. These circumstances deprive the supposed testimony of the 21st chapter to the Johannine authorship of the gospel of all weight. As long as we can tell nothing of its date, it cannot be accepted as a valid witness. An anonymous individual cannot attest what is itself anonymous, though he appears to separate himself from the author of the book itself by the use of '*we* know' in the twenty-fourth verse, where the plural may refer to a plurality of persons.

Apart from the appendix, the gospel itself indicates the authorship of a non-Palestinian.

(*a.*) In the Old Testament there are two ages or dispensations,[1] the Jewish and the Messianic; in the gospel, there are two worlds;[2] there, is Hades; here, heaven; there, judgment on the other side of the grave; here, eternal life and judgment upon earth. The Messiah is David's offspring according to Palestinian theology; here, he is the only-begotten of the Father; not the King of Israel but the King of truth; the Son of man who belongs to humanity not to Israel alone.

In conformity with the evangelist's universalist point of view, his terminology is separate from the Jewish Palestinian one,[3] savouring of Greek gnosis, the Alexandrian Book of Wisdom, and Philo.[4]

[1] αἰῶνες. [2] κόσμοι.

[3] παλιγγενεσία, αἰὼν οὗτος and αἰὼν μέλλων, ᾅδης, γέεννα, καθῆσθαι ἐκ δεξιῶν δυνάμεως, υἱοὶ Θεοῦ, κληρονομεῖν τὴν γῆν, δικαιοῦσθαι, etc.

[4] ὁ λόγος, ἡ ἀληθεία, ἡ ζωή, τὸ φῶς, ἡ σκοτία, ὁ παράκλητος, ὁ μονογενής,

(*b.*) It is commonly admitted that the fourth evangelist was acquainted with the synoptics, and drew material from them. This is most observable in the case of Luke, whose Lazarus becomes historical in John; though he had appeared only in a parable. But if the fourth writer was dependent on them for parts of his gospel, he did not repeat what he took, in the same form. It was wrought in his own way to subserve a general purpose. Thus he threw back the expulsion of the traders from the temple to the beginning of Jesus's ministry, agreeably to the aspect of His person presented at first. He even put in a wrong context the saying, 'a prophet hath no honour in his own country,' which he borrowed from Matthew xiii. 57, where it stands in its right place. The particle *for* (iv. 44) naturally relates to the preceding context, not to the subsequent verse as Tholuck takes it.[1] We do not think, however, that the writer's dependence on the synoptists is as great or far-reaching as Holtzmann and Hilgenfeld represent. Not a few of their examples in evidence of it are inappropriate. The evangelist had traditions unknown to the synoptists, some of them perhaps from disciples of the apostle John in Asia Minor—traditions which helped him to reproduce the speeches of Jesus. His materials were dominated and shaped by theology. Montanism tinged them. So did Gnosticism, for the author lived in its flourishing time, though he wished to present an eclectic system which should supersede it. As the tendency is theological, the synoptics could only be used freely; much being omitted because it was known.

If such was the author's procedure, his gospel would naturally present difficulties and errors, especially if he

ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καταβαίνειν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, τὰ ἐπουρανία, θεωρεῖν, θεᾶσθαι, ὁρᾶν spiritually, *ἄνωθεν γεννηθῆναι, ἀληθινὸς* designating what belongs to the world above, *γινώσκειν* applied to supernatural truth, etc.

[1] *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, p. 64.

were a non-Palestinian. These geographical and historical anomalies show an unapostolic writer. We refer to some.

In i. 28, a Bethany in Peræa beyond Jordan is spoken of, which had probably no existence. The topographical mistake points to some other writer than a Palestinian. We assume that *Bethany* not Bethabara is the true reading, as Origen attests, with the approval of Lachmann and Tischendorf. It is impossible to understand the well-known Bethany near Jerusalem, for the existence of two Bethanys is improbable.

'Go wash in the pool of Siloam (which is by interpretation, sent'), ix. 7. Here the evangelist interprets the name of the pool of Siloam by the Greek[1] *sent*, which is incorrect; for the noun means *an efflux of water, a fountain* or *spring. One sent* would be differently expressed in Hebrew. It is unworthy of an apostle to suppose that the pool had received its name because the Messiah was to send a blind man to it at some future time. A providential and prospective arrangement of this sort is a trivial point which an eyewitness would hardly record.[2] The etymologising remark, at once trifling and incorrect, betrays a distant and Gentile writer.

The statement that there was no intercourse between the Jews and Samaritans (iv. 9), betrays ignorance of the relations between them at the time of Christ. It was not forbidden a Jew travelling through Samaria to ask a drink of water. It was even allowable to partake of Samaritan food.

The depreciatory way in which the manna is spoken of does not suit a native Jew with his sacred associations. Without denying its divine bestowment, the

[1] *ἀπεσταλμένος.*

[2] Hitzig takes שִׁלֹחַ as a participle with the passive meaning, *sent*; but it is only a noun, as is shown by a few MSS. and the Targums, who write it שִׁילֹחַ after the form of a class of nouns.

language applied to it is inconsistent with the holy character it bore in the mind of a Jew (vi. 31, 32).

In viii. 31, etc., the Jews that believed on Jesus say that they were never in bondage to any man and seek to kill him. Surely their pride and self-conceit could not have blinded them so far as to make them forget the Roman yoke. That the construction which takes the subject of the verb *answered* (verse 33) to be *the believing Jews* is the grammatical one, even Olshausen admits.[1] It is less natural to suppose that the writer passes imperceptibly from believing Jews to others of an opposite character, and negligently omits to mark the change by putting the usual term *the Jews*.

In v. 18 we read, that the Jews sought to kill Jesus because he said that 'God was his Father, *making himself equal with God*.' The people could not draw that conclusion from his Messianic claim; and therefore it proceeds from a writer who attributes more than a Messianic sense to the title, a metaphysical and later idea equivalent to that of Logos.

In xii. 32–34, the multitude in Jerusalem take occasion from the words of Jesus, 'And I, if I be lifted up from the earth,' etc., to attribute to him the phrase *Son of man* which he did not employ at the time. Probably the Jews refer to a former conversation (iii. 14), but one which they did not hear, that held with Nicodemus. The evangelist has put an unsuitable phrase into their mouth.

In vi. 36 Jesus addressing the Jews in the synagogue at Capernaum speaks thus, 'But *I said unto you* that ye also have seen me and believe not.' Where do we find him so addressing them? The only probable allusion is to v. 37–44, where both language and scene are different, and the place, Jerusalem. There is an inaccuracy in the passage which betrays a writer recording sayings or composing them himself.

[1] *Biblischer Commentar*, zweiter Band, p. 216.

The fact that Annas is termed the high-priest, while Caiaphas is repeatedly so called (John xi. 49 ; xviii. 13, 19, 23, 24), is scarcely compatible with the authorship of a Palestinian Jew. That two high-priests could have existed at once is contrary to history ; and we know that Caiaphas was high-priest throughout the procuratorship of Pilate. It seems likely that the evangelist thought of the two performing the functions of the office alternately every year, from the expression *that same year* added to Caiaphas's name in xviii. 13. The hearing before Caiaphas, which appears to be historically correct, is slurred over by the fourth evangelist, and that before Annas, which is unhistorical, is set forth.

Evasions of this difficulty betray the weak cause of gospel harmonists. It is said that Annas still retained his title of office after he had been deposed. If so, why did not Ishmael, Eleazar, and Simon, who were high-priests after Annas and before Caiaphas, bear the title still ? The interrogation bespeaks a high functionary, not merely a man of distinction. The plain meaning of the evangelist is, that there was one hearing before Annas ; the meaning of the synoptics, that there was one before Caiaphas. It is very probable, as Scholten supposes, that the words of Luke iii. 2, where Annas and Caiaphas are spoken of together and the epithet high-priest indistinctly applied to both, gave occasion to the mistake. Does not the one exclude the other ? Was the examination before Annas preliminary to that before Caiaphas ? If so, why is the preliminary one given and the other omitted ? The fact that the evangelist gives that before Annas, shows that he looked upon it as the real priestly trial. If he knew the synoptic account, he does not follow it. Prior historical statements are disregarded. Thus he transfers the words occurring in xviii. 20, from the scene of his apprehension to that before the high-priest ; neither is Jesus the King

of the Jews in the fourth gospel as he is in Luke's, but *a spiritual* king, the king of truth.

But though the evangelist assumes no more than one hearing before Annas and passes over that before Caiaphas—a fact which harmonists find it hard to reconcile with the synoptic narrative—it is evident that he attaches little importance to the preliminary process, and attributes the chief significance to the audience with Pilate. The Jews had long resolved upon putting Christ to death, according to the writer of the fourth gospel; he receives something like justice from the hands of a Gentile.

In ii. 21, an explanation of the words 'Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up,' is subjoined which is altogether improbable. Christ did not refer to his body, and even if he did he must have pointed to it; whereas the apostles were first led to the apprehension of the words by his resurrection. Nor would there have been any propriety in symbolically alluding to his own body to justify the act of cleansing the temple. The unsuitableness of the evangelist's gloss is hesitatingly admitted by Neander.[1]

(*c.*) Traditional reminiscences are inserted in improper places.

Thus we read in xiii. 20: 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me.' Here there is no proper connection between the words spoken and the context. The sixteenth verse suggested by the law of association the kindred saying, and its natural position would be there; but it is delayed till the twentieth verse. It is difficult to perceive how such improper location originated. Did a few fragments only of the discourse reach the evangelist traditionally; or is the collocation accidental rather than designed?

[1] *Das Leben Jesu Christi*, pp. 283, 284, 4th ed.

Another instance is found in xiv. 31: 'But that the world may know that I love the Father; and as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do. Arise, let us go hence.' The position of the last clause is puzzling because the summons to depart does not take effect; the discourse is continued as if no such command had been uttered; and the speaker does not take his departure till a considerable time after. A little attention will show that the expression stands here designedly. It is taken from Matthew and Mark, where we read, 'Rise, let us be going; behold he is at hand that doth betray me.' The evangelist was unwilling to lose words in harmony with his endeavour to set forth the *voluntary* nature of the sufferings which Jesus underwent. The natural place for them would have been at the end of the valedictory discourses, in which case they would have been an exhortation to leave the city and go to the mount of Olives. But the writer intended to record there a prayer of Jesus to his heavenly Father, the impression of which would have been weakened by an exhortation to the disciples at the end. Hence the words in question had to be put earlier, at the point where Jesus represents his impending sufferings as an assault of the prince of the world. When he is going to meet the devil, such cheerful expressions are pertinent; though the disadvantage of the insertion appears when the valedictory discourses are continued as if the 'Arise, and let us go hence' had not been spoken. In the synoptic account, the words belong to the scene in Gethsemane—a scene inconsistent with the character of the fourth gospel. Soul conflicts had too much of the human to suit a gospel which describes the eternal Word. The omission of that scene, coupled with the wish to retain the words before us, occasioned the present collocation.[1]

(*d.*) The way in which the Jews are spoken of is

[1] See Strauss's *Das Leben Jesu*, pp. 554, 555, ed. 1864.

vague, indicating a relation foreign to that people. The writer seems to occupy a position distant from their religion and customs. Thus we find the expressions, 'after the manner of the purifying *of the Jews*;' '*the Jews*' passover was at hand;' 'there was a feast *of the Jews*;' 'the passover, *a feast* of the Jews, was nigh;' '*the Jews*' feast of tabernacles;' 'as the manner *of the Jews* is to bury' (ii. 6, 13; v. 1; vi. 4; vii. 2; xix. 40).

Christianity, though prefigured in the prophecies and types of the Old Testament, is altogether new, presenting no organic connection with Judaism. The Jews are 'the children of the devil,' who do not hear the voice of the Father and the Son. The evangelist expresses no hope or benevolent aspiration for their ultimate conversion as Paul does. They are never termed the 'people of God,' but 'the nation,'[1] a term which *they* applied to the heathen. Thus an anti-judaic feeling is ill-concealed in the gospel; the honourable appellation of *Jew* being nearly equivalent to 'enemy of Christ.' Nowhere is it more remarkable than in the words put into the mouth of Jesus: 'All that ever came before me are thieves and robbers' (x. 8). The writer's sympathies are more favourable to heathens and to Pilate himself than to the Jewish people. All this indicates a Gentile Christian, whose birth and education were remote from the privileged people.

In the synoptics, the Galileans are the warm adherents and friends of Jesus of Nazareth. The writer of the fourth gospel classes them under the general appellation *Jews*. In the former, Jesus applies to Nazareth the principle that a prophet has no honour in his own place; in the latter, it is applied to the Galileans in general. That the Galileans are undeservedly blamed appears from the statement that they are said to believe in Jesus because they saw what he did at Jeru-

[1] τὸ ἔθνος.

salem (iv. 45); and sought him not on account of seeing his miracles, but because they ate of the loaves and were filled (vi. 26). The classifying of Jews and Galileans together hardly suits a Palestinian Jew much less an apostle.

(*e.*) The character of the apostle John, as far as the New Testament and Church history reveal it, is inconsistent with the genius of the fourth gospel. In the epistle to the Galatians (ii. 7–12), he is mentioned along with Peter and James, as ignorant of any apostolic commission to preach the gospel to Gentiles. He appears there as a Jewish Christian holding a narrow view of the relation of heathenism to Christianity. Hence he could not have introduced into his gospel a passage like that in xii. 20, where Hellenists express a desire to be instructed by Jesus. All that is known of him goes to show a Jewish Christian of the usual type, holding the view of salvation entertained by the Petrine party respecting the obligation of the law on the Gentiles. There is no indication of his having adopted distinctive Paulinism. Like his fellow apostles he stood apart from Paul, having ideas which bigoted adherents who had stereotyped their notions from the first, urged against the Pauline liberalism. He could not indeed but feel the indirect influence of Paulinism, especially if he ministered where the latter had been disseminated; but the total abrogation of the law by the death of Christ remained outside his creed. He remembered that the Master with whom he had been associated conformed to the law; and that fact satisfied him without his caring to deduce the abolition of all legal distinctions as a consequence of Christ's teaching. Paulinism may have modified his individual intolerance without changing his characteristic belief as an apostle. Living as he did to see the growth of the tenets peculiar to Paul, he must have felt that God approved them; but he did not lay aside his own opinions on that account. How

could he renounce what all the apostles who had been personally selected by Christ believed and preached? Even when Jews and Gentiles accepted a greater than Moses, the former retained privileges above the latter. Such was the apostolic faith of the twelve in contrast with the broader one of Paul, whose genuine apostolate was denied because of its very breadth. By severing the connection between Judaism and Christianity he incurred not only the enmity of the Jews but the jealousy of the twelve, and was dissociated from them in consequence. In saying that John was one of the original apostles we endorse his Jewish prepossessions, and make his authorship of the fourth gospel with its anti-Jewish character an impossible thing. It proceeded from another atmosphere than that of the twelve, an atmosphere charged with spiritual thought shaped by an un-Jewish philosophy. This is corroborated by the Apocalypse, whose tone is more Jewish than that of any book in the New Testament. The name *Jew* is there a title of honour, instead of being equivalent to 'enemy of Christ.' Christianity itself is true Judaism. The Christian Church is a continuation of Israel, symbolised by the woman having on her head a crown of twelve stars. In the general destruction of the nation, only the tenth part of Jerusalem is said to fall; the temple, altar, and worshippers being spared. Among all people in the kingdom of heaven Israel has still a certain pre-eminence. The new Jerusalem has twelve gates guarded by twelve angels, upon which the names of the twelve tribes are written. The writer expects a new Jerusalem; he foretells the immediate return of Christ, the approaching resurrection of the dead, first of the righteous, for a thousand years; and then of all for final judgment. How different from the gospel, which knows of no personal reign of Christ. Instead of an outward judgment over which he presides, we have here the judgment which his words

pronounce on all that reject them, a judgment accomplishing itself in the believer's conscience. The coming of Jesus, instead of being future, is his spiritual presence, the continuance of that eternal life which he communicates to believers. Thus Christian thought in the gospel is entirely emancipated from the earlier Jewish doctrine of the second advent, which appears not only in the Apocalypse but in Paul's epistles. Jewish Christian eschatology is spiritualised by the evangelist, in harmony with the ideas expressed by Jesus himself in the parables of the leaven hid in meal and of the sower, which must be taken with other statements as a criterion to determine the authenticity of many expressions put by the synoptists into the mouth of Jesus respecting his future visible appearance in the clouds of heaven to set up a kingdom. That such Jewish Christian ideas are incorrectly attributed to John by later tradition, we have little doubt. Unless his views were materially altered towards the end of his life—a supposition utterly incredible—such conceptions as that Jesus should come again personally to set up a visible kingdom on earth, must be ascribed to unauthentic tradition. The second coming is spiritual. Christ lives for ever in and with his people.

The view of Christ's person given in the Apocalypse is also different. It is true that he is called the 'Word of God' in xix. 13, but merely because the Messiah proclaims the word of God not in the sense of the Word made flesh. The Apocalyptic Christ is not God, but is clearly distinguished from Him: 'his God' (iii. 12). Though termed 'the beginning of the creation of God,' as in Coloss. i. 15, he is still a descendant of David (v. 5). In Revelation xiv. he is by implication *an angel* (comp. verse 6 with the preceding context); and though he is the *alpha and omega* or *the first and the last* (i. 17; ii. 8; xxii. 13), just as God himself is called in i. 8, xxi. 6; an expression equivalent to Jehovah; *the*

name not *the nature* of Jehovah is predicated of Christ; agreeably to a Talmudic tradition that the name of the Eternal one was assigned to the Messiah as well as to the righteous and to Jerusalem (Jerem. xxiii. 6; Isaiah xliii. 7; Ezekiel xlviii. 35).

We learn from Polycrates bishop of Ephesus, that John was accustomed to wear the priestly mitre, implying that he was not emancipated from Jewish observances even in his old age.[1] In using this language it is improbable that Polycrates meant to give nothing more than a figurative representation of John's spiritual position in the church. The significance of the fact cannot be explained away by means of the apostle's own language in the Apocalypse, where stress is laid on the priesthood of believers. That high prerogative would scarcely be expressed outwardly by John himself in the form of a high-priest's mitre with a metal plate. And it is a mistake to suppose, that the special privileges of the *high-priest* are bestowed on the victorious Christian in Rev. ii. 17; the 'white stone' having no relation to the Urim and Thummim, as Züllig incorrectly imagines. The expressions applied by Polycrates to the old apostle at Ephesus are resolved into Hebrew imagery only by apologists.

(*f.*) The author of the gospel indicates that he was not an eyewitness of the sufferings of Jesus in xix. 35: 'And he that saw it bare record, and his record is true; and *that man* knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe.' Here the pronoun translated *that man*[2] introduced before the verb 'knoweth' marks a person different from the eyewitness and testimony-bearer spoken of at the beginning of the verse, who may have been the apostle John, or perhaps was so intended by the writer. The identification of the *writer*[3] with the *eyewitness*[4] is neither logically nor grammatically right

[1] Ap. Euseb. *Hist. Ecclesiast.* iii. 31, 3; v. 24, 3.
[2] ἐκεῖνος. [3] ἐκεῖνος. [4] ἑωρακώς.

in the verse, unless the words were 'he that saw *bears record*,[1] i.e. bears witness now in the act of writing. The past tense *bare record* points to an author who has already got the testimony of an eyewitness to whom he refers as a credible person. 'His witness is true,' are the words of an author appealing to an eyewitness—of one who is himself convinced, and wishes to assure his readers that the statement of his voucher is trustworthy. Hence Steitz's attempt to show that *that man*[2] must be identical with the *eyewitness* is nugatory, as Buttmann[3] and Hilgenfeld[4] prove. The pronoun in question *may* coincide with the subject of the verb *saw*, but the context indicates the reverse. Appeal to John ix. 35–37, where the same pronoun is used, decides nothing against the identity in this place. Ewald himself admits[5] that *the author of the gospel* (i.e. John, as he supposes) is alluded to by the younger friend that wrote from his dictation, and thus that *that man* is not equivalent to an emphatic *I*—a candid concession, whatever be thought of the assistant who is conjured up to save the apostle himself the trouble of writing and to explain other phenomena.

(*g.*) The mode in which the writer refers to 'the disciple whom Jesus loved,' 'the disciple,' etc., meaning the apostle John, hardly agrees with the fact of their identity. Whence this indirect way of pointing to John? Did it arise from modesty? Such modesty does not harmonise with John's known character (Matt. xx. 21; Mark iii. 17); and he speaks differently in the Apocalypse. The veil which is drawn over the person of the disciple is one method of directing attention to him. The best way of awakening in the readers that

[1] μαρτυρεῖ. [2] ἐκεῖνος.

[3] *Studien und Kritiken*, 1840, p. 505, *et seq.*, and Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift* for 1862, p. 204, *et seq.*

[4] *Zeitschrift* for 1861, p. 313, *et seq.*, and *Der Kanon und die Kritik des Neuen Testaments*, p. 230, note 1.

[5] *Jahrbücher*, x. p. 230.

entire faith which is connected with eternal life was to indicate the apostle as author. 'These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name.' Nothing was better fitted to induce this belief than an indication that the apostle whom Jesus loved was the writer; and such indication betrays the apostle's non-authorship; for he would hardly have described himself as the disciple whom Jesus loved instead of simply giving his name as is done in the Revelation.

No argument for an eyewitness's authorship can be built on the expression '*we* beheld his glory' in the prologue, because the writer speaks from the standpoint of a general Christian intuition, as is evident from the phrases '*as many as* received him,' 'of his fulness have *all we* received.'

(*h.*) The discourses of Jesus recorded in the gospel present a remarkable contrast in matter and form to those put into his mouth by the synoptists. We seem to hear the evangelist in them more than Jesus. The views and feelings of the author have moulded them into free compositions of his own. Thus the discourse with Nicodemus evidences a want of historical reality. The incongruity of the third verse with the second (chapter iii.), and the absurdity of the question asked in the fourth, show the character of the narrative, which the writer may have moulded out of the account of the rich man inquiring what he should do to be saved (Mark x. 17); or may have put together for the purpose of showing the influence of Christianity even over men of distinction among the Jews. The discourse also betrays its nature after the sixteenth verse, where many commentators think there is an insensible transition to the writer's own language. But the conversation does not break off at the fifteenth verse; nor is the following part so much an explanation as a continuation of what precedes. The

evangelist's terminology is distinctly seen in the phrases *only-begotten Son* and *loved darkness rather than light.* His manner appears even in the dialogue, especially the fourteenth verse, where the necessity of Jesus's death is communicated to Nicodemus obscurely, though clearer intimations were misapprehended by the disciples themselves; a fact which makes such language improbable in the mouth of Jesus to a ruler of the Jews. The reflective tone and universal purport of the death of Christ are scarcely consistent with the beginning of his ministry or adapted to the mental state of Nicodemus. And how could the evangelist have got a knowledge of the exact words that passed between the speakers in a private conference by night?

In like manner the writer himself is perceptible in the matter and manner of the Baptist's sayings: i. 16, etc.; iii. 31–36. With Origen, we suppose i. 16 a continuation of the Baptist's words, especially as the verse begins with *for*[1] according to the best evidence, not with *and.*[2] It is true that many attribute verses 16, etc., to the evangelist himself, since they are at variance with the knowledge the Baptist had of Jesus's person and dignity; but even in the fifteenth an acquaintance with the pre-existence of Jesus is assigned to the Baptist; which is hardly possible. The Baptist's ideas and words cannot be separated from the evangelist's in the passage, because the one has given his thoughts and words to the other.

Similar remarks apply to iii. 31–36, where there is nothing to note a transition from the conversation of John the Baptist to the remarks of the writer whose reflections are so intermingled with the words of the speaker that they cannot be separated. It is only necessary to put the statements of the Baptist, Jesus, and the evangelist in parallel columns to be convinced of their sameness of sentiment, style, and expression.

[1] ὅτι. [2] καί.

Scholten's table is the best proof of their common source.[1]

The truth of our observations is confirmed by the fact that the long discourses recorded in chapters xiv.–xvii. could not have been remembered thirty or forty years by the apostle John, without a power of memory contrary to the usual laws of the human mind. Psychological verisimilitude is violated by assuming their retention so long in the memory of a single person.

The best critics, De Wette, Lücke, Ewald and Hase, even Brückner and Luthardt, admit the writer's subjectivity in the discourses. B. Weiss candidly allows, that the gospel cannot be used as a source for the oldest tradition of Jesus's teaching, and that it has no claim to be a perfectly authentic record of his discourses; its late origin making it but a secondary account of what he said. The question therefore between him and such as deny apostolic authorship is one of degree. How much subjectivity is allowable? If the discourses contain that element, may they not be the product of the writer's own mind altogether? As long as the separating line of the subjective and objective cannot be drawn, it is unimportant whether they be attributed to the evangelist himself wholly or in part. The author's own sentiments and those enunciated by Jesus cannot be separated. The distinction between them is *formal* not *real*. The latter have a more popular; the former, a more doctrinal character. The latter are less connected or combined, being explanatory of the former. The doctrinal propositions of the author would be unintelligible without the discourses of Jesus, because they are general and abstract, often mere outlines without colour and shade, requiring the concrete development furnished by the utterances of Christ to show their particular object. Hence the author must have had the whole contents of the gospel in his mind when he began

[1] *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, p. 186.

to write; in other words, the work proceeded from a dominant purpose and was intended to embody certain leading ideas. Its essential unity is undoubted. All that is peculiar to Jesus as the speaker is, the designation of himself as *the Son of man*, and of the Spirit as *the paraclete*. On the other hand, all the author's doctrinal statements appear in the discourses of Christ, except the Logos *being in the bosom of the Father* and *revealing Him*, his *becoming flesh*, his *tabernacling*, his *fulness* and *grace*.

(*i.*) The style and language are very different from those of the Apocalypse. This is so plain, that it has become an axiom that the same writer could not have composed both. The language is good Greek, less Hebraistic than that of the Apocalypse and even than that of the synoptists. The diction is philosophic and mystical, full of abstract expressions. The improbability of the apostle's authorship is so apparent even to some who do not acknowledge the Johannine origin of the Revelation, that they invoke external aid. Ewald resorts to the assumption, that as John did not learn Greek till late in life, he was assisted by others in the composition of the gospel; and Bunsen asserts, that the bishops and elders of the Greek cities in Asia Minor edited the gospel in good Hellenistic Greek. Weizsäcker, whose concessions to the force of recent criticism are considerable, furnishes the apostle with non-apostolic assistants.

The tendency of the preceding observations is favourable to the late origin of the gospel. It is *possible* that the vehement and impassioned spirit which appears in the Apocalypse may have been transformed into the calmness which the work before us exhibits—that age and reflection may have caused great mental development, so that the writer became speculative, mystic, spiritualistic, theosophic, in his last days. The philosophy of Alexandria coming in contact with his

Judaic mind may have revolutionised it; and Hellenic culture may have widened his views of Christianity. The natural progress of a thoughtful man during the period of a generation, among churches which had enjoyed the labours of Paul, *may* account for the advancement perceptible in the apostle. But a change of this kind is to the last degree improbable. When the Revelation was written, the apostle must have been a sexagenarian. Could a revolution have been effected in the mind of one whose principles had been already stated in the Revelation? Could the narrow, energetic, fiery, imaginative spirit conspicuous in that book have been changed into one so comprehensive as to grasp the universal genius of Christianity? Were his surroundings in Ephesus, where Paulinism and Alexandrian speculation had settled, able to transform his mental idiosyncrasy, giving him spiritual depth, and softening his constitutional impetuosity into tender love? Until ripe manhood he was a Jewish Christian, having preached that form of the new religion, and shown his conviction of its truth in writing; could he cast it aside at the approach of old age, and compose a work in aid of *progressive* Christianity—a work far in advance of that one-sided belief which he had so long held, the outcome of an enlarged and philosophic reflection which former convictions must have repelled? It is not easy to accept this mental metamorphosis; or to picture the apostle writing the gospel amid the weaknesses of age. Psychology refuses to allow it.

(*k.*) It is plain that the author meant his work to be taken for the apostle's. He intimates that he was an immediate disciple of the Lord, *the beloved disciple*, who was none other than the apostle John; and avoids all mention of the *name*. Instead of employing a direct method of marking the one personated, he is contented with an indirect process which served his purpose more effectually. To make his character correspond with the

nature of the gospel, he idealises the apostle to a certain extent. As the person and work of Jesus present a higher aspect than they do in the synoptics or even in Paul's epistles, it was proper to give the supposed author a higher stature. Accordingly, while Peter enjoys the pre-eminence in the synoptics, John has it here. It is he that rests his head on the Saviour's bosom and is favoured with his intimate friendship. To him the dying Jesus consigns the care of his mother, in preference to the brethren and other apostles, so that he becomes the adopted brother of the Master. He is known to the high-priest, and procures Peter's entrance into the palace ; a circumstance unlikely in the case of a Galilean fisherman. As he takes the precedence of Peter on all occasions, the praise which Jesus bestowed on the latter after his confession is omitted ; and the denial of his Master is related without the repentance. John remains faithful to Jesus, even to the end ; Peter's courage quails before a maidservant. Of all the disciples John is the only one at the cross. Thus Peter, whom the early Jewish Christian Church glorified to the disparagement of his brethren, recedes into the background. The gospel puts a damper upon his personal character by presenting it in marked contrast to John's quiet, unalterable devotion to Jesus. While the latter is acquainted with the mind of Christ, the former has little spiritual perception of it, swayed as he is from one pole of feeling to its opposite, with unsteady balance. Peter went into the empty sepulchre ; John saw and believed after he went. Paul had already dethroned Peter from the primacy by placing apostolicity on a higher pedestal than that of knowing Christ after the flesh. The fourth evangelist, with the same object, depreciates apostleship by suppressing the very name, as if evidence of the earthly life of Jesus were a thing of no moment in comparison with the revelation of his essential nature to the inner vision. Agreeably to this ideal exaltation of

John, his summons from fishing on the sea of Galilee is omitted; he passes at once from the Baptist to Jesus, after the prophet of the wilderness had declared the latter to be the Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world. The Galilean fisherman of the synoptists is introduced at once as one of John the Baptist's disciples, and transferred to Jerusalem, as the evangelist has no liking for the Galileans; preferring to represent him as a person of superior position in life, the friend of the high-priest. Thus the fourth gospel is a contrast to the first three and the epistle to the Galatians with respect to Peter's precedence, because it makes John the head of the spiritual Church, the representative of a universal, not a Judaised, Christianity. Doubtless the sacred memories that had gathered round his name, and the traditions that lingered in the minds of his hearers, with the fact of his surviving all the apostles, led the writer to select him as such, and to invest his character with an excellence which his actual portrait disallows. Under the inspiration of a Gentile Christian, the Jewish Christian apostle—impetuous, ambitious, intolerant—becomes the calm preacher of love, the speculative disciple whose heart is as large as his view is extended; the expounder of a new and absolute religion founded by the only begotten Son.

(*l.*) The purport of these remarks on the apostle John will be furthered by a comparison of the doctrinal system peculiar to the gospel with that of Paul. Love is the central idea of the former, attachment or love to the person of Jesus producing mutual love in his followers. But though Paul attributes a high value to the love of God, he puts it over against justice, in consequence of his view of the law. As man cannot free himself from the law without its claims being satisfied, its penal requirements fulfilled and a ransom paid, the death of Christ becomes the leading particular in which the entire work of redemption was completed. That

death has a central significance in the Pauline conception which it has in no other apostolic writing. In the doctrinal system of the fourth gospel, the death of Christ has not the same importance, because the law is so far removed from its circle of ideas that its claims are looked upon as antiquated. The view taken of Christ's person does not admit the elevation of any phase of redemption to such predominating importance as to become the centre of the entire work. Christ atones by all his earthly manifestation. The author of the fourth gospel is so far in advance of the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith, that he cannot place the main problem of Christ's redeeming efficacy in liberation from the claims of the law. The vicarious and satisfying nature of his death are unsuited to the view of the gospel, where the person of Jesus appears in its unity and entireness, so that no one aspect of it, no act of his life, can have a fixed prominence. Paul looks upon Christianity from a point of view that puts sin and grace, death and life opposite to one another in the historical development of humanity. In this way the practical interests of mankind who need redemption are considered the highest object of Christianity. The writer of the gospel looks at Christianity theoretically, presenting it as the revelation of God himself to humanity, expressed in the idea of *the Word*. Christianity is the elevation of consciousness into the sphere in which God is apprehended as Spirit. When the invisible God has been revealed to the spiritual consciousness by the only begotten who is in the bosom of the Father, and has passed into that consciousness as its absolute fulness, the object of Christian revelation is realised. Such is the view of the gospel before us.

(*m.*) The subject presents some embarrassing circumstances, so that it is difficult to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. Though the balance of evidence is

clearly against the gospel's authenticity, it is not easy to account for the early belief of its Johannine origin otherwise than by assuming that it arose in the circle of John's disciples about Ephesus, under different influences. A severance of Gentile from Jewish Christianity had been effected by Paul in the churches of Asia Minor. His free principles had created an atmosphere of liberal thought. These principles, however, had been pushed back by John. Dominated by Jewish Christianity, they had ceased to spread in Asia Minor, and were probably narrowed down to a limited circle. Something more than Paulinism is needed to account for a gospel so peculiar. The philosophy of Philo and of Alexandria generally had imbued the minds of cultivated Gentiles in Asia Minor. The leaven of Gnosticism was fermenting. Montanism had appeared; and the gospel's contact with it is seen in the development of the peculiar moments contained in that system. Instead of confounding the Alexandrian Logos and the Old Testament spirit (*pneuma*), the two are separated, with their mutual relations and specific features. The logos is exclusively assigned to Christ's person; the individualised paraclete to the church, as His successor and representative. If a disciple of John wrote the gospel, he had learnt more than his master. He had meditated on high problems, and believed that he could incorporate the philosophy of the time with Christianity. His intellect was speculative. He was an advanced Pauline who saw in the sayings of Jesus the germs of a far-reaching religion; and linked them expanded to a philosophical tendency in harmony with Gentile culture. In any case it is unlikely that the recorded acts of Jesus, or all the speeches put into his mouth, are pure invention. But the historical substratum is small, for the gospel presents ideas rather than facts; it is Gnostic and docetic, not historic. An *immediate* disciple of John himself can hardly have written a work so anti-

Jewish and Hellenic. If it proceeded from one of the presbyters in Asia Minor of whom Irenæus speaks as being closely connected with John, the fact of its being taken for the apostle's could be more easily explained. In that case, it might be called a product of the Johannine spirit originating in the sphere of the apostle's labours under different influences. But this is not likely, because the basis from which the writer advanced is Pauline. He had a larger spirit than that of John; larger even than Paul's. Instead of Jewish narrowness he had a wide catholicity. His philosophic reflectiveness was unlike the fiery energy of John; his separation from Judaism completer than Paul's. He was more than Arnold's 'theological lecturer' who often combined and set the gnomic sayings of Jesus improperly. He could create. It may be that he did not handle in the best way the sayings of Jesus which he is said to have got from John: but who shall correct his alleged faults and bring forth from the gospel he redacted the words that proceeded from the Master's mouth? It is improbable that the apostle could have retained them so long in his memory without transformation; or that such transformation would have been made in the direction which Mr. Arnold accepts; for the examples of Jesus's genuine utterances which he picks out of the gospel, differ from the authentic ones recorded by Matthew.

It is singular that the author should have remained in miraculous concealment. That the spirit which was elevated so far above his contemporaries as to present aspects of Christ and his religion fitted to attract humanity in all time, should continue unknown, seems strange to us. But authorship was then a different thing. Had the gospel appeared with the writer's name, it might have failed in its object; and therefore it was composed in a way to convey the impression that it proceeded from an apostle specially

beloved by the Master and admitted to His secret thoughts.

The reception of the work was not very rapid. It seems to have existed for a time before it was much known; the tradition of its Johannine origin gradually passing from an *indirect* to a *direct* form. The increasing esteem that gathered round it was aided by the fact that most of the oldest witnesses in its favour received their theological culture in or from Rome. There Tatian lived for years. Thence proceeded the doctrines of Heracleon and Ptolemy. The Gallic churches with Irenæus of Lyons received their traditions from that quarter. Apollinaris and Theophilus are the only exceptions. Perhaps its reception was first fixed at Rome. Taken, as we may conjecture, from Asia Minor to Rome soon after its composition, with a hazy curtain of Johannine tradition overhanging it, it spread thence into other countries. The force of circumstances and the mental atmosphere of the day aided its general adoption, because the Judaic Christianity of the primitive apostles was waxing old. If the new religion were to endure, it must cease to be an offshoot of Judaism and stand on an independent basis, which it could only do by grafting itself on the higher instincts of spiritual humanity and appropriating the speculative element of the Hellenic mind. It must be at once abstract and practical. The Logos as God's eternal reason must be embodied in a man, that the world beholding the revelation of the divine, might inquire, wonder, and adore.

We conclude the discussion of authorship with remarking, that if tradition were trustworthy it would be decisive in favour of the Johannine authorship. But it is weak at the commencement, where the interval between the apostle and the first witness on his behalf is long enough to allow a new opinion to spring up and spread. Internal evidence outweighs the external; and the latter must yield. It is indeed possible to conceive

of cases in which the external must be believed in preference to the internal; but all the links are then complete, none weak or wanting. In the present instance, the internal is the stronger, and must decide the question. A tradition, however, which dates so far back and has been uniformly held by the Christian Church, is exceedingly tenacious. Why disturb it with doubts and objections? Is not the criticism which seeks to dislodge it too recent to upset antiquity? If the evidence be sufficient to discredit traditional authorship, it must be accepted in the face of stereotyped tradition and cherished prejudices. Distasteful though it be to many, criticism must pronounce a fair estimate. Ingenuity will try to lessen the force of the internal evidence against John's authorship, and to make it agree with the external; it has emphasised the fact that there are two distinct aspects of Christ's person—two natures in one exalted being—the synoptists describing one, the fourth gospel the other; it has minimised the differences between the views of the respective documents and smoothed over discordant features; but reason refuses to be satisfied. The gospel is still a theological more than a biographical composition, and reflects an Alexandrian atmosphere foreign to Galilee. It overpasses the Ebionism of the synoptists, and mars the human portraiture.

The date already specified (about A.D. 150) agrees with the character of the times. Gnosticism had not become odious to Christians generally, and the moderate Gnosticism of the gospel would find a point of contact in the contemporaneous consciousness. Montanism, with its doctrine of the paraclete, was not fully developed, else the gospel would not have favoured so unguardedly the fundamental principle that the Holy Spirit continues the work of Christ in the Church. This suits the date A.D. 150 or the time of Justin, whose view of the Logos comes nearest the Johannine.

There is a way of looking at these conscious fictions which does injustice to their authors and is foreign to the Oriental mind. They were usual both before and after Christ's coming. The books of Daniel and Ecclesiastes are examples. Both Jewish and Christian apocalyptic literature presents many specimens. The book of Enoch, the Clementine Homilies, and others, are similar. The motives of the writers were good. No deliberate fraud was meditated; at least in our sense of the word. It was a common practice to put forth a work under the cover of a well-known name, to procure its readier acceptance. Such was the method in which good men often conveyed their sentiments and taught the public. It is not ours; nor does it fall in with modern notions of rigid morality. Being theirs, however, it is but fair to judge them from their own point of view. The end was unexceptionable; the means were in harmony with the prevailing notions of the time. Had the parties believed these means to be wrong or immoral, they would not have adopted them. It should also be observed, that the authors had no idea of the use that would be made of their compositions, by a rigid separation of them into canonical and uncanonical; the former to be taken as an infallible standard of faith, and the latter not. Neither apostles nor evangelists wrote as conscious organs of a dictating Spirit; nor did they suppose themselves elevated so far above others as to claim for their writing a direct divine authority. They laboured in the interests of truth, as they thought they might best promote it.

The value of a book does not depend on the person who wrote it; neither does it rest on his being an eyewitness of the events described, or a hearer of the words recorded, except it profess to be authentic history; and even then, human infirmity may colour its pages. The fourth gospel would certainly have greater authority, had it been written by an apostle and eyewitness, for

its christology is ideal. Yet it has a germ of substantial truth, though it be not historically exact. Jesus Christ is the life and light of men. So far as our hearts and lives enter into fellowship with him, in proportion as his spirit penetrates ours, do we become true Christians. Christianity is not a creed but a life; while we accept the Son of God as our life and are baptized with his spirit, we are lifted above the metaphysical distinctions of the most conspicuous writers in sacred history. This great unknown, in departing from apostolic tradition, teaches us to rise above it. He has seized the spirit of Christ better than any apostle; and if we get thoughts that bring us into union with the ideal of purity—the moral image of the loving Father who gave him up as a sacrifice—we shall have a faith superior to that which feeds upon the visible and miraculous.

(*n.*) The preceding observations make it unnecessary to examine a few passages, which are cited to prove that the work was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. It is inconclusive to found an argument for early composition on the present tense in chapter v. 2, 'There *is* at Jerusalem by the sheep gate, a pool *having* five porches,' as though the pool Bethesda still existed, and the porches were standing. Eusebius and Jerome speak of the pool as well known in their times, so that the Romans did not destroy it; and it is natural for the position of it to be described, *at the sheep* gate, though the gate had been destroyed. Vespasian did not demolish everything in the city. He allowed several things to remain, for the use of the garrison which was to be stationed there; may not these porticos, so convenient to bathers, have been permitted to stand? The evidence of xxi. 18 is not valid in favour of the early composition. How, it is asked, could John, or some disciple of his who added the last chapter, have omitted to refer in this place to the death of Peter, which had happened some thirty years before? We

answer, that a remark about the apostle's crucifixion thirty years before would have been superfluous, because the fact was well known.

In proof of the opinion that the gospel was not written till the close of the first century, Hug adduces such passages as xi. 18 ; xviii. 1 ; xix. 41 ; where the imperfect tense *was* is applied to localities connected with Jerusalem.[1] But it is common to use the imperfect tense when things continue in the same state as before. If the question cannot be decided without these insignificant particulars it is incapable of solution.

THE IMMEDIATE OCCASION AND OBJECT.

We attribute no polemic design to the author, no specific antagonism to contemporaneous sects or persons. It is very unlikely that the gospel was composed against Cerinthus and the Nicolaitanes, Marcion and the Valentinians, as Irenæus states. Nor do we venture to assert that it made its appearance in the interests of the paschal controversy, as Baur intimates. Had it come forth in direct opposition to any of the leading movements of the day, to the Valentinians, the Montanists, the Quartodecimans, to any of the Gnostic sects, or even to the prevailing notions of catholic Christians which were antagonistic to these, it would not have been so soon accepted. The author's object is given by himself in xx. 31, viz. that his readers might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that through believing they might have life in his name. These two propositions, *Jesus the anointed Son of God, life in his name*, appear throughout the gospel. They include the fundamental idea that Christianity is the absolute religion—an idea which other New Testament writers have, without giving it the same prominence or putting it at the

[1] *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, zweiter Theil, vierte Auflage, p. 232.

head of a treatise and making it pervade all its doctrines. The idea is here inculcated with constant relation to Judaism and heathenism, especially the former, making the teaching of the work at once apologetic and polemic, so that it gives *the history of religion* as well as what *religion itself is*, by showing the present and permanent nature of Christianity in opposition to Mosaism and Polytheism. Bearing in mind this general design, the author thought it desirable to be mediating and comprehensive. Instead of presenting an opposing front to the conflicting elements of the spiritual world, he wished to supply what they lacked and to embrace them all within Christianity, giving a prominent place to love as the fulfilment of law. The principle of comprehension and mediation is seen in various parts. Thus in the 6th chapter at the fifty-third and following verses, eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of man is strongly insisted on, while it is stated immediately after, 'It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.' Again, in x. 29 we read, 'My Father which gave them me is greater than all;' but it is added, 'I and my Father are one;' and in xiv. 28, 'My Father is greater than I.' The work satisfied the wants of the age. Even when it counteracted instead of meeting some tendency, it nurtured a speculation that exalts and purifies. It propounded a christology which the church could rest upon. The Valentinians, with their æons and syzygies, would accept it. The Montanists would welcome its announcement of the paraclete, who was to teach the doctrines which Christ could not promulgate to unprepared disciples. The catholic Church saw in it a gospel purer, deeper, more spiritual and comprehensive than the synoptical — a Gnostic Christianity satisfying the desires of the theosophic through its sublime precepts as well as its mysterious apprehension of the divine nature, soaring above the new doctrines of which heretics and schismatics boasted.

Even the Quartodecimans could accept it without difficulty, because they were able to explain it in harmony with their practices. But this party was clearly a minority. And though John must have worked at Ephesus in their direction, the theosophic tendencies of the time showed them that they could not hope to retard the progress of a freer Christianity which separated itself entirely from the primitive type preached by the twelve apostles. While Paulinism silently enlarged its influence in a region where it had been planted, its characteristics suiting the mental atmosphere, not only of Asia Minor but of the cultivated world, the fourth gospel reaching higher and penetrating deeper even than Paulinism, was welcomed by catholic Christians and the sects, as the exposition of a revelation to which they could link their moral aspiring, or from which they might develop cosmogonical and mythological processes. That the Logos was embodied in a real man—here was intellectual leaven for the fermentation which worked in the schools of the Gnostics, transforming abstract neuters into mythological masculines. The direction and restraint given to gnosis by the writer were most salutary. Nor did the work come with acceptance only to the metaphysical and cultivated. What comfort to souls wearied with the world or restless amid the agitations of the times, would flow from the sublime and pathetic discourses of the Saviour, which he addressed to the disciples immediately before he left them to battle with sin in the world, not alone, for the paraclete would be with them. Here Christianity appears as the religion of the absolute, in opposition to Judaism and heathenism—a complete and final religion intended for humanity. 'The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.' 'The true light, coming into the world, enlightens every man.'

It is unnecessary to discuss the various hypotheses

propounded respecting the evangelist's purpose, which assume the Johannine authorship. Many have thought that the apostle wrote with the view of supplying things wanting in the synoptics; an opinion as old at least as Eusebius, who has a tradition to the effect that the apostle being shown the other three approved of them and afterwards wrote his own work by the entreaty of friends, to complete what was wanting in his predecessors. Like many other stories, this is baseless. It is likely that the fourth evangelist saw the three gospels; indeed marks of his acquaintance with them are not wanting; but the opinion that he wrote with the view of supplementing them is incorrect. If he had a purpose relating to them, it was to supersede their contents. The gospel bears internal evidence of its originality, and is complete in itself without a supplementary aspect.

INTEGRITY.

The 21st chapter, which is obviously a supplement, did not proceed from the writer of the gospel. Instead of the whole chapter, some regard the last verse alone as spurious, in which they have the support of ℵ *a prima manu*, and the indications contained in some scholia. Other critics begin the appendix-part in the twenty-fourth verse with the words 'and we know that,' etc. The hyperbolical nature of the twenty-fifth verse accounts for its being suspected; and the last part of the twenty-fourth cannot be separated from the preceding one. Meyer asserts that the chapter does not fall with the spurious appendix; we agree with Lücke in holding that it does. The following considerations show that the chapter was not written by the evangelist himself.

1. The gospel fairly concludes with the 20th chapter, as the last two verses prove. Is it likely that

the author would resume his pen? If he did he would have removed the verses.

2. The commencement of the 21st chapter, 'After these things,' etc. etc., is unsuitable to the last two verses of the 20th, whose contents reject the reference of 'these things' to them. The pronoun rendered 'these things' can only allude to the twenty-sixth and twenty-ninth verses of the 20th chapter, which is so awkward as to show a different writer for the 21st, who did not wish to alter the conclusion of the work in xx. 30, 31.

3. The twenty-fourth verse, which is copied from xix. 35, betrays the separation of the writer from the evangelist, by the use of the plural *we* know. Or if the plural stand for the singular, what is the meaning of a writer saying at the same time of himself, 'The disciple that wrote these things,' and 'We know that his testimony is true'? Besides, the phrases 'testify of these things,' 'wrote these things,' apparently refer to the preceding work, to chapters i.–xx., which is an unsuitable allusion for a simple pronoun to bear. If it be thought that the 'these things' of xxi. 24 include the 21st chapter also because of the commencing words of xxi. 25, 'There are also other things,' we admit the reference; but the assignment of the additional chapter to the apostle's attestation is awkward.

4. After the 20th chapter, none could have expected from the same writer a third appearance of the risen Jesus; since we read in the thirtieth verse that many other *proofs*[1] of his resurrection had been given to the disciples, which are not in the present book. Could the author therefore record another?

5. The discourse between Peter and Jesus is essentially different from that held with Thomas, because it descends to individual relations and circumstances, without passing into general ideas after the evangelist's manner.

[1] σημεῖα.

6. 'The sons of Zebedee,' in the second verse, is the language of the synoptics not of the fourth gospel. And Peter has a pre-eminence which the work intentionally ignores. The beloved disciple is also described as a fisherman, a fact omitted by the evangelist, who represents him as a person of distinction, and transfers his abode from Galilee to Jerusalem.

7. The visible return of Jesus (*till I come*, verse 22) is unlike the evangelist, who resolves that return into the paraclete's presence.

8. The scene is Galilee, of which there is no mention in the previous record of the appearances of the risen one. The evangelist usually specifies Galilee when Jesus and his disciples are there (i. 43 ; iv. 3, 43 ; vi. 1 ; vii. 1) ; he does not say here that they went to that district.

9. The explanation given in xxi. 20, 'which also leaned on his breast at supper, and said, Lord, which is he that betrayeth thee ?' is superfluous from one who had written xiii. 25.

10. One purpose of the writer of this chapter discovers itself in the relation between the apostles Peter and John. To the former is assigned the headship of the Church, 'feed my sheep ;' the latter is a spiritual mediator between the Lord and his Church, 'that he tarry till I come.' The honour of martyrdom belongs to the one ; that of continued spiritual existence to the other. But this purpose is only subordinate to the more general one, the attestation of the gospel by referring it to an apostle. It is probable that the work was at first undervalued by Jewish Christians, because of the inferior position which Peter occupies in it. Hence the author of the appendix brings Peter into prominence, yet without serious disparagement to John, 'If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee ?'

11. The narrative has a minuteness of detail and a

specification of numbers which show a striving after vividness without attaining it. The generality of the evangelist's manner is absent.

12. The language differs from that of the gospel. Thus we find *ἐρχεσθαι σύν* (3) for *ἀκολουθεῖν*; *νῦν* put after the verb (10), though it precedes the imperative elsewhere; *φέρειν* instead of *ἄγειν* (18); *πρωΐας γενομένης* (4) for *πρωΐ*; *ὑπάγω* with the infinitive (3); *παιδία* (5) for *τέκνα*; *ὁ μαρτυρῶν* (24) for *ὁ μεμαρτυρηκώς*; *ἰσχύειν* (6) for *δύνασθαι*; *ἐπενδύτης* (7) for *ἱμάτιον* or *χιτῶν*; *ἐπιστραφείς* (20) for *στραφεὶς εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω*; *στῆναι εἰς* (4) for *ἐπί*; *ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν* for *ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν* (14); and *οἶμαι* (25), *αἰγιαλός*, *ἁλιεύειν*, *ἀποβαίνειν*, *ἀριστᾶν*, *βόσκειν*, *γηράσκειν*, *ἐξετάζειν*, *ζωννύναι*, *κατὰ* distributively, *μακράν*, *πῆχυς*, *ποιμαίνειν*, *προσφάγιον*, *σύρειν*, *τολμᾶν* are peculiar to the chapter. *τί πρός σε* seems to be taken from Matt. xxvii. 4.

These considerations show another hand than the evangelist's. Difference of time without difference of authorship will not account for the characteristics of the chapter. The gospel is not only ratified, but supplemented in a different spirit. The idea that the same person attested his own work at a later period of life is a modern hypothesis. Peter and John were both dead when verses 19–23 were written. Probably a Jewish Christian wrote the supplement before the end of the second century. No MS. is so ancient as to be without it. Hilgenfeld's attempt to show that the chapter was an original part of the gospel is a failure. He has indeed Weitzel on his side; but the voice of true criticism is against both.

It has been thought that several small interpolations in the gospel have proceeded from the hand that wrote the 21st chapter, because expressions occur which do not suit the general spirit of the work. Were the author self-consistent, we might assign various clauses and verses to a later hand, perhaps

to that which wrote the 21st chapter, where the Jewish Christian point of view respecting the Lord's coming is taken; such as v. 28, 29; the clause 'and I will raise him up at the last day,' in vi. 40, 44; and 'at the last day,' vi. 39; xii. 48; but this assumption of Scholten's is arbitrary.

Another part of the gospel, whose authenticity is justly questioned, is vii. 53–viii. 11.

1. The paragraph is found in upwards of three hundred MSS., among which are the uncial D. F. G. H. K. U. Γ. It is marked with an asterisk or obelus in E. M. S. Δ. Π. Several of the copies that have it put it at the end of the gospel. Others put a part there, i.e. viii. 3–11. Others have it after Luke xxi. 38 (13, 69, 124, 346) and one after John vii. 36. Jerome states that it was in many Greek and Latin MSS. in his day.

2. Of versions it is in some MSS. of the old Latin, *b.* c. e. ff.² g.*; in the Vulgate, Ethiopic, Jerusalem Syriac, etc.

3. It is mentioned by Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Sedulius, Leo, Chrysologus, Cassiodorus.

On the other hand, it is wanting in ℵ, A. B. C. L. T. X. Δ., in more than fifty cursive copies, and thirty lectionaries. That A. wanted it is probable, because the two leaves deficient here could not have contained the portion. It should also be remarked that C. is defective from vi. 50 to viii. 12, but must have wanted it. In L. and Δ. the blank space is not large enough to contain the piece. Those codices that have it with asterisks or obeli evidence so far against it. The scholion of cod. i. observes that it is wanting in most copies; and Euthymius says it is not in the most accurate.

It is not in the Syriac Peshito (MSS. and oldest editions), in the Philoxenian, the old Latin (codd. Vercellensis, Brixianus, Monacensis, etc.), the Memphitic, Thebaic, Armenian (oldest codd.) and Gothic versions.

Of the fathers, it is passed over by Cyprian, Tertullian, Origen, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom, Basil, Juvencus, Nonnus, Cosmas, Theophylact, etc.

It must be allowed that the silence of some of the fathers is unimportant, because the subject may not have led them to speak of the paragraph. This applies to Origen. But the silence of Cyprian and Tertullian is weighty, because both wrote on subjects where it would have been peculiarly appropriate. Granville Penn puts the case forcibly with regard to Tertullian, who wrote a book on chastity.[1]

It was not in Ammonius's Harmony, and not therefore in the MSS. he had. The codices which have the section as G. M., and the Ammonian numbers in the margin, do not mark it with any special number.

Much of the suspicion against the passage would be removed, if Augustine's method of accounting for its omission could be believed, viz. the fear of some, that the liberty of indulging in sin apparently afforded by it might be countenanced. Nicon gives this reason for the Armenians excluding it. But that cause could not have operated uniformly among Greeks and Latins. Critical reasons may have led to its rejection as well as doctrinal ones. The only thing favourable to Augustine's assertion is, that several copies omit no more than viii. 3–11. Matthæi[2] has laboured unsuccessfully to explain Chrysostom's silence consistently with his knowledge of the paragraph; for though the pious orator may have deemed it inexpedient to expound the story before a voluptuous people, it was read before his time. It cannot be shown that the Greek church had it in their copies before the fifth century, or the Latins before the third. It came from the West into the East, not later than the fifth century. The oldest MS. that has it is D. of the

[1] See *Annotations to the Book of the New Covenant*, pp. 267, 268.

[2] *Evangelium secundum Joannem, Græce et Latine*, Appendix i.

sixth century. There are three principal readings of the passage, which differ considerably from one another as Griesbach gives them. The text is very unsettled, because there were original varieties—a fact adverse to the genuineness of the paragraph.

External evidence is unfavourable to the acceptance of the verses as an original part of the gospel. Hence Lachmann and Tischendorf expunge them.

Internal evidence is on the same side. The difficulties belonging to the paragraph lead to its rejection.

1. The context is against it. The paragraph is introduced abruptly, without any proper connection with what precedes; and it is also dissociated from the subsequent context. If it be omitted, unity is restored. The first verse is peculiarly awkward: 'Every one went unto his own house,' which must mean, either that every one of the Sanhedrists had gone to his home, or that each one of the people had retired for the night. The former sense is improbable; the latter, which seems to be favoured by the first and second verses, is remarkable, because the feast was now past.

2. The difficulties of interpretation are so great that Lücke and De Wette confess their inability to resolve them.

(*a.*) The scribes and Pharisees must either have acted by authority of the Sanhedrim or in their private capacity. If the former, they would not have allowed the woman afterwards to escape, but have taken her before those in whose name she had been apprehended. If the latter, how could they say, 'Moses commanded *us*,' etc., as if they were official judges entrusted with the execution of the law? The account leaves it uncertain whether the scribes and Pharisees were witnesses and accusers or judges.

(*b.*) In the Pentateuch, the punishment of death is enjoined for adultery (Levit. xx. 10; Deut. xxii. 23); and the Talmud specifies *strangulation* as the mode.

Here stoning is said to be the punishment. Thus another difficulty arises, of which all the solutions yet proposed are unsatisfactory.

(*c.*) No adequate motive can be assigned, why the scribes and Pharisees employed the case for embarrassing Christ and extracting a ground of accusation against him. Here again many have tried to explain the reason; but there is great difficulty in discovering it.

(*d.*) The style and language of the paragraph differ from the rest of the gospel. Thus we find δέ, whereas the evangelist has usually οὖν; ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸ ὄρος instead of ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος; ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν is derived from the synoptists; ὄρθρου instead of πρωΐ or πρωΐας γενομένης; παρεγένετο, instead of ἀνέβη or ἔρχεσθαι, εἰς; πᾶς ὁ λαός for ὄχλος; οἱ γραμματεῖς is never used by the evangelist; καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς is not like his diction; κατειλημμένην is used in a sense in which he does not employ the verb; ἐν μέσῳ ἱστάναι instead of εἰς τὸ μέσον; ἐνετείλατο for γέγραπται, ἔγραψεν, γεγραμμένον ἐστί. The pronoun ἡμῖν should be after the verb, not before it; λιθοβολεῖσθαι instead of λιθάζειν; ἔγραψεν is unlike the evangelist's language; ἐπέμενον, ἐρωτῶντες, ἀναμάρτητος, συνείδησις, ἀνακύπτειν, κατακύπτειν, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, εἷς καθ' εἷς, ἐπαυτοφώρῳ, καθίσας, κατήγορος, μοιχεία, μοιχεύειν, πρεσβύτερος, are ἅπαξ λεγόμενα; ἐσχάτων is an unsuitable antithesis to πρεσβυτέρων; πλήν instead of εἰ μή; κατέκρινεν for ἔκρινεν. The use of ἕως as a preposition, of ἵστημι transitively, of οἶκος for *a house* not the temple, is singular. So many phrases unlike those of the evangelist are crowded into the verses, that it would be strange if they proceeded from him.

Thus internal evidence is as adverse to the genuineness as the external. The disjointed nature of the preceding and succeeding context, the difficulties inherent in the fifth and following verses, the language and style show another author.

Some have thought that it was taken from the Gospel of the Hebrews, because Eusebius speaks of a story in that work respecting a woman accused before Jesus of many sins, which was also given by Papias. Strauss supposes that it is another form of the story respecting the sinner in the house of Simon the Pharisee, which is contained in Luke vii.; but the term *accused* applied to the woman does not suit the female introduced there. Hitzig[1] thinks, that Mark wrote the paragraph; Schulz assigns it to Luke. The simple truthfulness of the story stamps it with credibility, and points to early evangelical tradition as its source. It is not certain where or when it was first written. We believe that the earliest record of it was in the gospel according to the Hebrews.

STYLE AND DICTION.

The style is characterised by simplicity and ease. It is plain without elegance, tolerably free from Hebraisms, and the diction is comparatively pure. It has been pronounced indeed strongly Hebraic; but all Hellenistic Greek has a Hebrew basis; and the gospel has less colouring of that sort than many parts of the New Testament. Genuine Greek expressions, and the peculiar constructions of classical Greek, are by no means rare. The Hebraised nature of the style appears most from the manner in which sentences are connected. Instead of the language being periodic, like that of Paul, who puts his materials in a dialectic form, the fourth evangelist exhibits the evangelical history with great simplicity, placing the successive ideas in juxtaposition rather than logical connection. Verses and sentences are usually connected by the particles καί, οὖν, and δέ. It is this method which gives his style a Hebraic character, while the Greek is predominant in

[1] *Ueber Johannes Marcus und seine Schriften*, p. 205, *et seq.*

Paul, because he writes in a periodic form. Yet the gospel is written in good Hellenic Greek, though inferior to that of Luke.

The author's stock of words was not copious. The same terms and phrases are repeated, indicating a paucity of linguistic materials. His mastery of Greek was not great, though he employs appropriate terms to express his ideas. And it was not always easy to find suitable words for his ideas.

1. *ἀμὴν* is doubled at the beginning of a discourse, i. 52, etc.; twenty-five times in all.

2. In quotations from the Old Testament, *ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος* or *ἡ γραφή*, xii. 38; xiii. 18; xv. 25; xvii. 12; xviii. 9; xix. 24, 36.

3. *ὁ λεγόμενος Δίδυμος* is added to the name *Θωμᾶς*, xi. 16; xx. 24; xxi. 2.

4. John the Baptist has not *βαπτιστής* annexed to his name, as in the other evangelists.

5. *θάλασσα τῆς Τιβεριάδος*, with reference to the sea of Galilee, vi. 1; xxi. 1.

6. *ἴδε* not *ἰδού*, i. 29, 36, 47, 48; iii. 26; v. 14; vii. 26, 52; xi. 3, 35, 36; xii. 19; xvi. 29; xviii. 21; xix. 4, 5, 14. In xix. 26, 27, *ἴδε* is probably the right reading. The other evangelists employ *ἰδού* much oftener than *ἴδε*.

7. *μετὰ ταῦτα* and *μετὰ τοῦτο* in general designations of time, ii. 12; iii. 22; v. 1, 14; vi. 1; vii. 1; xi. 7; xiii. 7; xix. 28, 38; xxi. 1. Matthew never uses either; Mark has *μετὰ ταῦτα* once, and Luke five times.

8. *μέντοι*, iv. 27; vii. 13; xii. 42; xx. 5; xxi. 4. Not in the other gospels.

9. *οὐδέν* is put after the verb, iii. 27; viii. 28; x. 41; xviii. 20; xxi. 3. This is rare in the other evangelists.

10. *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι* (not *ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι*), v. 43; x. 25; xii. 13, 14, 26, etc.

11. The use of the optative is discarded. The reading of the received text has it once, but is incorrect (xiii. 24).

12. *τὴν ψυχὴν τιθέναι* x. 11, 15, 17; xiii. 37, 38; xv. 13. Matthew and Mark have *τὴν ψυχὴν δοῦναι.*

13. *ὄχλος* in the singular is always used, except once. The other evangelists have both singular and plural, the latter oftener.

14. *παροιμία* for the *παραβολή* of the synoptists, x. 6; xvi. 25, 29.

15. *τὰ ἴδια*, *home* or *dwelling*, i. 11; xvi. 32; xix. 27.

16. *πιάζειν* vii. 30, 32, 44; viii. 20; x. 39; xi. 57; xxi. 3, 10.

17. *θεωρεῖν* twenty-three times. In Matthew twice, Mark six times, and Luke seven times.

18. Only the perfect *ἑώρακα* of *ὁράω* is used. Matthew and Mark never have this tense; Luke has it three times.

19. The use of *οὖν* as a connecting particle is far more frequent than in the other gospels. Indeed it occurs as often in the fourth as in the other three united. Generally in narrative.

20. *ἀλλ' ἵνα* together, i. 8, 31; iii. 17; ix. 3; xi. 52; xii. 9, 47; xiii. 18; xiv. 31; xv. 25; xvii. 15; xviii. 28. Mark has the phrase once, xiv. 49. *ἵνα* with the subjunctive supplies the place of the infinitive in classic Greek.

21. The same expressions are frequently repeated immediately after, in the same sentence, as i. 7, 8, 14; iii. 11, 17, 34; v. 31–39, 44–47; viii. 13, 14, 18; x. 17, 18; xvii. 6; xviii. 15, 16; xix. 35; xxi. 24.

22. Connected with this repetition, and to give emphasis to the ideas, is the use of the demonstrative pronouns *οὗτος* vi. 46; vii. 18; xv. 5; and *ἐκεῖνος* i. 18, 33; v. 11, 37; x. 1; xii. 48; xiv. 21, 26; xv. 26; when a clause has separated the subject and the verb.

23. The writer expresses the same idea positively and negatively, i. 7, 8, 20; iii. 15, 17, 20; iv. 42; v. 24; viii. 35; x. 28; xv. 5, 6, 7.

24. Allusions to what had been already related are common, as in iv. 54; vi. 23, 71; vii. 50; x. 40; xviii. 14, 26; xix. 39; xxi. 14, 20.

25. The author frequently subjoins explanatory remarks, as i. 39, 42, 43, etc. etc.

26. The following are peculiar constructions: *ποιήσατε ἀναπεσεῖν—ἀνέπεσαν οὖν* vi. 10. *συναγάγετε τὰ κλάσματα—συνήγαγον οὖν* vi. 12, 13. *εἱστήκει κλαίουσα—ὡς οὖν ἔκλαιεν* xx. 11. *βάλετε—ἔβαλον οὖν* xxi. 6. *τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν—καὶ τοῦτο εἰπών* xxi. 19.

A series of leading terms and phrases is peculiar to the writer, expressing the chief ideas of his theology. These constitute his distinctive terminology.

27. *ὁ λόγος* i. 1–14; *ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός* i. 14, 18; iii. 16, 18. *δόξα* is attributed to the Word, i. 14; ii. 11; xii. 41; xvii. 5, 22.

28. *τὸ φῶς* i. 4, 5, 7, 8, 9; iii. 19, 20, 21; viii. 12; ix. 5; xi. 9, 10; xii. 36, 46.

29. *ἡ ἀλήθεια* i. 14, 17; iii. 21; iv. 23, 24; v. 33; viii. 32, 40, 44–46; xiv. 6; xvi. 7, 13; xvii. 17, 19; xviii. 37, 38.

30. *ἡ ἀγάπη* v. 42; xiii. 35; xv. 9, 10, 13; xvii. 26.

31. *ἡ σκοτία* i. 5; vi. 17; viii. 12; xii. 35, 46; xx. 1.

32. *ὁ κόσμος* seventy-eight times. Matthew has it nine times; Mark and Luke each thrice.

33. *ἁμαρτία* sixteen times. Matthew has it seven times; Mark six; and Luke eleven times.

34. *σάρξ* i. 13, 14; iii. 6; vi. 51, 55, 63; viii. 15; xvii. 2.

35. *παράκλητος* xiv. 16, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7; *τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας* xiv. 17; xv. 26; xvi. 13.

36. *τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ* i. 12; xi. 52.

37. *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* fifteen times. Three times in Matthew, twice in Mark, and three times in Luke.

38. *φανερόω* i. 31; ii. 11; iii. 21; vii. 4; ix. 3; xvii. 6; xxi. 1, 14.

39. *κρίνειν* nineteen times; *κρίσις* eleven times.

40. *πιστεύειν* is very frequent, commonly followed by *εἰς*.

41. *ζωοποιεῖν* v. 21; vi. 63.

42. *ἐξελθεῖν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀπὸ, παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός* viii. 42; xiii. 3; xvi. 27, 28, 30; xvii. 8.

43. *ἔρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον, εἰς τὰ ἴδια* i. 9, 11; iii. 19; vi. 14; ix. 39, *κ.τ.λ.*

44. *καταβαίνειν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* i. 32; iii. 13; vi. 33, 38, 41, 42, 50, 51, 58.

45. *αἴρειν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν* i. 29.

46. *ζωὴν διδόναι τῷ κόσμῳ* vi. 33.

47. *περιπατεῖν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ* xi. 9, and its opposite *ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ* or *ἐν τῇ νυκτί* viii. 12; xi. 10; xii. 35.

48. *γεννηθῆναι ἐκ Θεοῦ, ἄνωθεν, ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος* i. 13; iii. 3; iii. 5–8.

49. *ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*, or without the pronoun, xii. 31; xiv. 30; xvi. 11.

50. *ἀγαπᾶν τὸν Πατέρα, τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἀλλήλους* viii. 42; xiii. 34; xiv. 15, 21, 23, 24, 28, 31; xv. 12, 17; xxi. 15, 16.

51. *ἡ ἐσχάτη ἡμέρα* vi. 39, 40, 44, 54; vii. 37; xi. 24; xii. 48.

52. *μένειν ἐν—Χριστῷ, τῷ λόγῳ, τῇ ἀγάπῃ* viii. 31; xiv. 10; xv. 4–7, 9, 10.

53. *εἶναι ἐκ* or *εἶναι ἐν* metaphorically, iii. 31; vii. 17, 22; viii. 23, *κ.τ.λ.*

54. *ἀνάστασις ζωῆς, κρίσεως* v. 29; xi. 25.

55. *μαρτυρία τοῦ Ἰησοῦ* iii. 11, 32, 33; v. 31, 32, 34, 36; viii. 13, 14. *μαρτυρέω* is very frequent; whereas it occurs but once in Matthew, and once in Luke.

The following phrases and words are peculiar to the fourth gospel:

ἀλλαχόθεν, ἀλόη, ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀνθρακιά, ἀντλεῖν, ἄντλημα, ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπε, ἀποσυνάγωγος, ἄῤῥαφος, ἀρχιτρίκλινος, ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου, βάϊον, βιβρώσκειν, γενετή, γέρων, γλωσσόκομον, δακρύειν, δειλιᾶν, διαζωννύναι, δίδυμος, ἐγκαίνια, ἔθνος applied to the people of Israel, ἐκνεύειν, ἐμπόριον, ἐμφυσᾶν, ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ (ἀπὸ) Θεοῦ, ἐξυπνίζειν, ἐπάρατος, ἐπιχρίειν; ἔρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἐκ Θεοῦ; ἤπερ, ἦλος, θεοσεβής, θήκη, θρέμματα, εἶμι (?), κέδρος, κειρίαι, κέρμα, κερματιστής, κηπουρός, κλῆμα, κοίμησις, κολυμβήθρα, κομψός, κομψότερον, κρίθινος, ὁ κύριος vocative, λέντιον, λίτρα, λόγχη, μεσοῦν, μεσάζειν, Μεσσίας, μετρητής, μίγμα, μονή, μονογενής of the Son of God, νιπτήρ, νύσσειν, ὄζειν, ὀνάριον, ὁσδήποτε or οἱοσδήποτε, οὐκοῦν, ὀψάριον, πενθερός, περιδέειν, πέτρος, πότερον, προβατική, προσαίτης, προσκυνητής, πρῶτός μου, πρῶτος ὑμῶν, πτέρνα, πτύσμα, ῥέειν, Ῥωμαϊστί, σκέλος, σκηνοπηγία, συγχρῆσθαι, συμμαθητής, συνεισέρχεσθαι, τεταρταῖος, τετράμηνος, τίτλος, ὑδρία, ὑφαντός, φανός, φραγέλλιον, χαμαί, χείμαῤῥος, χολᾶν, χωρὶς an adverb, ψωμίον.[1]

QUOTATIONS.

John.	
i. 23	Isaiah xl. 3.
*i. 51	Genesis xxviii, 12.
ii. 17	Psalm lxix. 9.
*iii. 14	Numbers xxi. 8, 9.
vi. 31	Psalm lxxviii. 24.
vi. 45	Isaiah liv. 13.
*vi. 49	Exodus xvi. 15.
*vii. 22	Leviticus xii. 3.
*vii. 38	Isaiah xliv. 3; lviii. 11.
*vii. 42	Psalm lxxxix. 4; cxxxii. 11; Micah v. 2.
*viii. 5	Leviticus xx. 10; Deut. xxii. 22.
viii. 17	Deut. xvii. 6; xix. 15.
*ix. 31	Proverbs xv. 29.
x. 34	Psalm lxxxii. 6.
xii. 13	Psalm cxviii. 26.
xii. 15	Zechariah ix. 9.

[1] See Zeller's *Theologische Jahrbücher*, vol. ii. p. 477, *et seq.*

*xii. 34	Psalm cx. 4; Daniel vii. 14.
xii. 38	Isaiah liii. 1.
xii. 40	Isaiah vi. 10.
xiii. 18	Psalm xli. 9.
xv. 25	Psalm lxix. 4; xxxv. 19.
*xvii. 12	Psalm xli. 10; cix. 8, 17.
xix. 24	Psalm xxii. 18.
*xix. 28, 29	Psalm lxix. 21.
xix. 36	Exodus xii. 46.
xix. 37	Zechariah xii. 10.

Those marked thus * are allusions or general references rather than quotations.

The quotations are commonly from the Septuagint, and are never derived immediately from the Hebrew. It would have been otherwise had the writer been a Palestinian Jew. Sometimes they are literal, as in x. 34 ; xii. 38 ; xix. 24 ; sometimes they are free, as in i. 23 ; vi. 31 ; xv. 25 ; xix. 36. In all cases the influence of the LXX. is visible, except in xiii. 18 and xix. 37. With respect to these it should be remembered that other Greek versions existed at the time besides the Alexandrian ; and when the latter was obscure another was preferred. The peculiar reading in xix. 37 is also found in the Apocalypse, and in Justin independently of both. Bleek adduces xii. 40 as a passage in which the Hebrew was used. But the language of it is free and inexact, giving the sense not words of the original and agreeing neither with it nor with the Greek version. We do not think that the Hebrew lies at the basis of the citation ; though Bleek asserts that it does. His argument for the use of the original resolves itself into the two quotations (xiii. 18 ; xix. 37), which admit of a satisfactory explanation on other grounds. The advocates of the gospel's apostolic authenticity who build up the author's acquaintance with the Hebrew original and his consequent Jewish birth on this slender foundation adopt a precarious argument.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER.

RELATION TO JUDE'S EPISTLE.

EVERY READER sees that the second chapter of this epistle, along with the commencement of the third, bears a close resemblance to Jude's letter. What is the cause of the similarity ? If the parallelism extends to words as well as ideas, it must be explained by assuming that the one writer borrowed from the other. The following considerations prove that Peter made use of Jude's epistle.

(*a.*) The phraseology of Jude is ordinarily simpler than that of Peter which is more artificial, rhetorical, and paraphrastic in the majority of cases.

JUDE.	2 PETER.
For there are certain men *crept in unawares,* who *were before of old ordained to this condemnation,* ungodly men, turning the grace of our God *into lasciviousness,* and *denying the only Lord God* and *our Lord Jesus Christ* (4).	But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you who *privily shall bring in* damnable heresies, even *denying the Lord that bought them,* and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their *pernicious ways* (lasciviousnesses), etc. etc. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you; whose *judgment* now *of a long time* lingereth not (ii. 1–3).
He hath reserved in everlasting *chains* under *darkness* (6).	Having cast them down to hell, delivered them into *chains of darkness to be reserved* unto judgment (ii. 4).

JUDE.	2 PETER.
Are set forth for an *example*, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire (7).	Reducing to ashes condemned them with an overthrow, making them an *ensample* unto those that after should live ungodly (ii. 6).

In ii. 6 the writer of Peter's second epistle, apparently feeling the improbability of the punishment still continuing, softened it away by confining himself to the historical fact. Had Jude followed Peter, it was sufficient for him to present the destruction of the Sodomites as an example.

Defile *the flesh* (8).	Walk after *the flesh* in the lust of uncleanness (ii. 10).
Speak evil of dignities (8).	Are not afraid *to speak evil of dignities* (ii. 10).
In those things *they corrupt themselves* (10).	Shall utterly perish *in their own corruption* (ii. 12).

In the last passage the change in second Peter is made for emphasis.

Woe unto them! for they have gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error *of Balaam for reward*, and perished in the gainsaying of Core (11).	Following the way *of Balaam of Bosor*, who loved *the wages* of unrighteousness (ii. 15).
Their mouth speaketh *great swelling words* (16).	When they speak *great swelling words* of vanity (ii. 18).
But, beloved, *remember ye the words which were spoken before of the apostles* of our Lord Jesus Christ; how that they told you there should be *mockers in the last time, who should walk after their own ungodly lusts* (17, 18).	This second epistle, *beloved*, etc. etc., that ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets and of the commandment of us *the apostles*, etc. etc., knowing this first that there shall come *in the last days scoffers walking after their own lusts*, etc. (iii. 1–3).[1]

Here the writer of second Peter has abridged the original.

These are *spots in your feasts of charity, when they feast with you,*	They count it pleasure to riot in the day time. *Spots* they are and

[1] See the Greek table in De Wette's *Einleitung*, p. 357, *et seq.* The words italicised are commonly alike or nearly so, in Greek.

JUDE.	2 PETER.
feeding themselves without fear; clouds they are *without water, carried about of winds* . . . . wandering stars, *to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever* (12, 13).	blemishes, sporting themselves *with their own deceivings while they feast with you* . . . . wells *without water*, clouds that are carried with a tempest; *to whom the mist of darkness is reserved for ever* (ii. 13, 17).

(*b.*) Expressions in Jude's epistle are changed in a singular way. Thus the word *sea-rocks* (Jude 12)[1] on which vessels are wrecked becomes in 2 Peter ii. 13 *spots*.[2] *Love-feasts* or *agapæ* in Jude (12) become *deceits*[3] in 2 Peter ii. 13. The latter reading indeed is not certain, and Lachmann has both words alike; but Tischendorf favours the common reading. *Clouds without water* in Jude (12) is changed in 2 Peter (ii. 17) into the more usual *wells without water*.[4] These alterations show Jude's originality, not the opposite as Dietlein and Schott argue.

(*c.*) Passages in Peter are so indefinite in their language as to be obscure without the light of Jude's parallels. Thus 2 Peter ii. 4 is less distinct than the corresponding passage in Jude 6, because neither the particular sin of the angels nor their punishment is specified; whereas the latter says that 'they did not keep their dominions, but left their own habitation (heaven),' going after strange flesh, like Sodom and Gomorrah, i.e. after the daughters of men. Peter employs the general word *to sin*, and avoids reference to the book of Enoch. In like manner 2 Peter ii. 11 is unintelligible apart from Jude 9. The language is general; and the reader cannot tell to what the writer alludes. Few of those who are well acquainted with the Jewish Scriptures could guess his meaning. Peter, taking it for granted that Jude's epistle was already known to his readers, contents himself with an indefinite statement to the effect that there was a dispute between

[1] σπιλάδες. [2] σπῖλοι. [3] ἀγάπαι changed into ἀπάται.
[4] νεφέλαι ἄνυδροι altered into πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι.

angels and fallen spirits: angels who are greater (than these self-willed blasphemers) in power and might; do not bring against them (angelic dignities) a railing accusation. Jude, on the other hand, has a definite statement. We learn from him, that the dispute was between Michael and the devil about the body of Moses. Hence *angels* in Peter means *good angels*, Satan being included among *angelic dignities*. The plural number is employed to express in a more general way what Jude gives clearly in the singular.

(*d.*) The opponents described and denounced in Jude are distinctly portrayed; the picture of them in 2 Peter is not clear. The former speaks of men atheistical in practice; the latter of false and vicious teachers. The liveliness, brevity, and close relation between the parts of the picture presented by Jude, show originality and independence; in amplifying, diverging into generalities, and contracting, Peter commonly loosens the coherence of ideas. This is vainly denied by Brückner, who twists everything with minute ingenuity into a clear, well-arranged, designed, and definite sequence on the part of the latter author, just as if 'these as natural brute beasts made to be taken and destroyed;' 'speak evil of the things they understand not;' and 'shall utterly perish in their own corruption' (ii. 12), were not a deterioration of Jude's 'these speak evil of those things which they know not; but what they know naturally as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves' (10); or the introduction of ii. 10, which apparently resumes ii. 1–3, though the coherence is vague, were as natural as the parallel in Jude 8; or as if the coherence of 2 Peter ii. 1 with the preceding context were as good or clear as that of Jude 4, where the adversaries are first mentioned.

(*e.*) That Jude should have extracted a very brief epistle, energetic and powerful as it is, from a longer one is less probable than that the author of the longer

should have used the shorter. Were it otherwise, the question would arise—What advantage could result from another sacred penman putting into the form of a distinct epistle a few verses similar to part of an epistle already existing?

The dependence of our epistle on Jude's consists with a degree of freedom, as is shown by enlarging, contracting, adding, separating, combining, excluding. The original is sometimes simplified, but oftener not. While the language is occasionally improved, it is not so in the majority of instances. (Compare the original in Jude 6 with 2 Peter ii. 4.)

In opposition to these arguments, Hengstenberg after Heydenreich adduces Jude 17, 18, compared with 2 Peter iii. 3: 'But, beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ; how that they told you there should be mockers in the last time, who should walk after their own ungodly lusts.'—'Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers walking after their own lusts,' etc. Here, it is said, that Jude refers to a prophecy found in New Testament writings, before he wrote. The allusion cannot be to Acts xx. 29; to 1 Tim. iv. 1, etc.; to 2 Tim. iii. 1, etc.; or to 2 Thess. ii. 3, though these passages have been mentioned. It is to 2 Peter iii. 3.[1] Such is Hengstenberg's argument; but it is inconclusive, because Jude's language is, words '*spoken* before by the apostles,' which does not imply that they were written.

Another argument adduced by Heydenreich and adopted by Hengstenberg is, that errorists are said by Jude to have already appeared and endeavoured to get into the churches; whereas in Peter they are future, and his readers are forewarned against them.

This statement overlooks the fact that the errorists are described in second Peter, both as present and

[1] *Die Offenbarung des heiligen Johannes, u. s. w.*, vol. i. p. 19, *note.*

future. Besides, the picture of them given by the latter writer shows an advance. While Jude does no more than hint at their misleading influence (16, 19); it appears strongly in second Peter (ii. 3, 4, 18). No definite object is assigned to the mockers of the last time in Jude; in Peter's epistle the second advent is the thing they scoff at. The former represents the errorists as denying God and Christ (4); the latter concentrates that denial on the power of the Redeemer Christ (ii. 1). The former presents them as agitators and deceivers; the latter as false teachers (ii. 1). Both writers point to the same persons generally; one borrowing from the other; but the variations show an advance under the pseudo-Peter's hands, not indeed in definiteness or consistence but in time.

AUTHENTICITY.

Allusions to the epistle have been found in Clement's letter to the Corinthians: 'Noah preached repentance, and those who obeyed him were saved' (2 Peter ii. 5).[1] Here the reference is slight; and the words may have been taken from the Old Testament. In another place Clement has: 'On account of his hospitality and piety, Lot was saved out of Sodom, when all the surrounding region was condemned with fire and brimstone. God made it appear that He does not forsake those who trust in Him; but on the other hand those who turn aside He appoints to punishment and torment' (ii. 6–9).[2] It is possible that these words may refer to the passage in Peter, since a twofold moral is drawn from the history of Sodom and Gomorrah in both; but it is doubtful. In like manner, 'Let that be far from us which is

[1] Νῶε ἐκήρυξε μετάνοιαν, καὶ ὑπακούσαντες ἐσώθησαν.—Cap. vii.

[2] διὰ φιλοξενίαν καὶ εὐσέβειαν Λὼτ ἐσώθη ἐκ Σοδόμων, τῆς περιχώρου πάσης κριθείσης διὰ πυρὸς καὶ θείου. πρόδηλον ποίησας ὁ δεσπότης, ὅτι τοὺς ἐλπίζοντας ἐπ' αὐτὸν οὐκ ἐγκαταλείπει, τοὺς δὲ ἑτεροκλινεῖς ὑπάρχοντας εἰς κόλασιν καὶ αἰκισμὸν τίθησι.—Cap. xi.

written, Miserable are the double-minded, who are the doubtful in their mind, which say, "These things have we heard even in the time of our fathers; and, behold, we are grown old, and none of these things have happened to us."'[1] This passage can scarcely be considered an allusion to 2 Peter iii. 4. It is introduced by '*this scripture* saying;' and may perhaps allude to the apocryphal work called the *Assumption of Moses.*

Lardner and Dietlein find allusions to our epistle in Hermas: 'They are such as have believed, but through their doubting have forsaken the true way' (2 Peter ii. 15).[2] The resemblance is too slight to warrant the conclusion that Hermas referred to the epistle. Again: 'The golden part are ye, who have escaped this world' (2 Peter ii. 20).[3] This passage does not prove its use. But though the places themselves furnish no clear evidence of acquaintance with 2 Peter, Brückner supposes that their contexts make the thing probable. We do not think so. The resemblance of the words that immediately follow in iii. 7, viz. 'they withdraw themselves and walk again after their wicked desires,' to 2 Peter ii. 22; iii. 3; and of 'ye who dwell among them,'[4] to what is said of Lot in 2 Peter ii. 8, is insufficient to bring the passages quoted from Hermas iii. 7 and iv. 3 into designed connection with 2 Peter ii. 15 and 20 respectively. It is also very improbable that i. 5, etc., where faith develops into love, floated before the mind of Hermas in writing iii. 8; or that the account of the retribution for luxurious pleasures in the sixth similitude, had respect to 2 Peter ii.[5]

[1] *πόῤῥω γενέσθω ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη ὅπου λέγει· ταλαίπωροί εἰσιν οἱ δίψυχοι, οἱ διστάζοντες τὴν ψυχήν, οἱ λέγοντες· Ταῦτα ἠκούσαμεν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, καὶ ἰδοὺ γεγηράκαμεν, καὶ οὐδὲν ἡμῖν τούτων συμβέβηκεν.*—Cap. xxiii.

[2] *οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ πεπιστευκότες μέν, ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς διψυχίας αὐτῶν ἀφίουσιν τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτῶν τὴν ἀληθινήν.*—*Visio*, iii. 7.

[3] *τὸ δὲ χρυσοῦν μέρος ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ οἱ ἐκφυγόντες τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον.*—*Visio*, iv. 3.

[4] *Visio*, iv. 3.

[5] See Brückner's edition of De Wette's *Handbuch* on Peter, Jude, and James, p. 140, 3rd ed.

Nothing in Polycarp or Ignatius shows acquaintance with our epistle. The same remark applies to Barnabas, since the use he makes of the words in Psalm xc. 4, though similar to that of 2 Peter iii. 8, is not coincident either verbally or in idea;[1] and the series of virtues enumerated in the second chapter is different from that given in 2 Peter i. 5, etc. Thus the apostolic fathers generally furnish no proof of their acquaintance with the second epistle of Peter; a fact which Dietlein's efforts to find correspondences make all the more palpable.[2]

Justin Martyr, in his 'Dialogue with Trypho,' says 'We have also understood that the saying, "a day with the Lord is as a thousand years," belongs to this matter' (2 Peter iii. 8).[3] The same passage is cited by Barnabas and Irenæus.[4] There is no certainty that Justin took the words from 2 Peter iii. 8, for Psalm xc. 4 may have been the original; and the succeeding context does not prove that 2 Peter was the source, as Dietlein supposes. Nor does the following chapter of Justin make the alleged proof more probable by using the same word *false teachers*, as is in 2 Peter ii. 1,[5] and in the same connection with the 'false prophets.'

The two passages in Irenæus, in which the expression 'the day of the Lord is as a thousand years' occurs, are not exactly the same as that in Peter, and may also refer to Psalm xc. 4. The connection in Irenæus iv. 70, where the flood, evil angels, and Lot are mentioned, with 2 Peter ii. 4–6 is imaginary.

Lardner quotes the following passage from Athenagoras: 'Of Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the other prophets, who according to the ecstasy of the thoughts in them, the Divine Spirit moving them, spoke out the

[1] Cap. xv.

[2] Compare his *Der Zweite Brief ausgelegt*, Einleitung, p. 3, *et seq.*

[3] *συνήκαμεν καὶ τὸ εἰρημένον, ὅτι ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἔτη, εἰς τοῦτο συνάγει.—Dial. cum Tryph.* § 81.

[4] *Adv. Hæres.* lib. v. 23, 2, and 28, 3.

[5] *ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι.*

things which were working in them,'[1] which is supposed to allude to 2 Peter i. 21. But the allusion is indefinite. The idea expressed was a common one; and the language bears little resemblance to the supposed original. Tertullian and Cyprian never quote the epistle.

Theophilus of Antioch writes: 'Men of God, filled with the Holy Ghost, and becoming prophets, inspired by God himself, and being enlightened, were taught of God' (2 Peter i. 20, 21).[2]

It is possible, but not probable, that these words may be a paraphrase of 2 Peter i. 20, 21. The idea of prophets being moved by the Holy Ghost is not exclusively Petrine. And the phrase 'men of God,' found in Theophilus and 2 Peter, occurs in the second epistle to Timothy.

Another passage in Theophilus, viz. 'The ordination of God is this, His word shining as a lamp in a house confining it, gave light to the whole world under heaven' (2 Peter i. 19),[3] is a doubtful proof of the epistle's existence, because the comparison of God's word to a lamp was common. It is more probably from fourth Esdras xii. 42.[4]

A tract of Melito, bishop of Sardis, published in Syriac by Cureton, purporting to be an oration addressed to Antoninus Cæsar, and assigned to A.D. 160 or 161, has the following: 'There shall be a flood of fire, and the earth shall be burnt up together with its mountains, and men shall be burnt up together with the

[1] *καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν προφητῶν, οἱ κατ' ἔκστασιν τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς λογισμῶν κινήσαντος αὐτοὺς τοῦ θείου πνεύματος, ἃ ἐνηργοῦντο ἐξεφώνησαν.—Legat. pro Christianis*, p. 9.

[2] *οἱ δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι πνευματόφοροι πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ προφῆται γενόμενοι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐμπνευσθέντες καὶ σοφισθέντες ἐγένοντο θεοδίδακτοι. —Ad Autolycum*, lib. ii. p. 87, ed. Colon.

[3] *ἡ διάταξις οὖν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦτό ἐστιν, ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ φαίνων ὥσπερ λύχνος ἐν οἰκήματι συνεχομένῳ ἐφώτισε τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανόν.—Ibid.* p. 92.

[4] 'Tu enim nobis superasti ex omnibus prophetis—sicut lucerna in loco obscuro.'

idols which they have made,' etc.[1] We do not agree with the editor in thinking that 2 Peter iii. 10, 12, is 'certainly alluded to here, and consequently appears to have been admitted by one of the earliest and most learned writers of the Christian Church in the second century, as genuine.'[2] The allusion is merely probable. But the authenticity of the tract is doubtful, because Eusebius is silent respecting it, though he mentions Melito's Apology to Marcus Antoninus Pius. The passage from the 'Paschal Chronicle' adduced by Cureton, to prove that Melito presented an Apology to the emperor five years before the well-known one, is unreliable evidence in its favour. Melito does not attest the authenticity of our epistle.

The extant works of Clemens Alexandrinus contain no reference to our epistle. But Eusebius says: 'In his Outlines, to speak briefly, he gives concise explanations of all the canonical Scriptures, not omitting those which are contradicted; I mean the epistle of Jude, and the other catholic epistles, and the epistle of Barnabas, and the so-called Revelation of Peter, and the epistle to the Hebrews,' etc.[3] The testimony of Cassiodorus respecting Clement is to the same effect: 'They say, therefore, that Clement of Alexandria illustrated the divine writings of the Old and New Testament from beginning to end, in the Greek language.'[4] But Cassiodorus says elsewhere, that Clement gave some illustrations in the Greek language of the canonical epistles, i.e. of the first epistle of Peter, the first and second of John, and the epistle of James;[5] whence Mayerhoff[6]

[1] *Spicilegium Syriacum*, p. 51. [2] *Ibid.* p. 95.

[3] *ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὑποτυπώσεσι ξυνελόντα εἰπεῖν, πάσης τῆς ἐνδιαθήκου γραφῆς ἐπιτετμημένας πεποίηται διηγήσεις, μὴ δὲ τὰς ἀντιλεγόμενας παρελθών· τὴν Ἰούδα λέγω καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς καθολικὰς ἐπιστολάς· τήν τε Βαρνάβα καὶ τὴν Πέτρου λεγομένην ἀποκάλυψιν· καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους δὲ ἐπιστολήν, κ.τ.λ.*—*Hist. Eccles.* vi. 14.

[4] 'Ferunt itaque scripturas divinas veteris novique testamenti ab ipso principio usque ad finem, Græco sermone declarâsse Clementem Alexandrinum.'—*De Instit. divin. script.* lib. præf.

[5] *De Institut.* cap. viii. [6] *Einleitung in die Petrinischen Schriften*, p. 207.

and others infer that Clement commented only on the epistles mentioned. The language of Eusebius and the other statement of Cassiodorus are too clear to be set aside or weakened. The historian had read the Outlines of Clement; whereas we gather from Cassiodorus, that he had only an extract from them containing the specified epistles. Photius also speaks of Clement's explications of the catholic epistles.[1] Hence we must believe that Clemens Alexandrinus was acquainted with the second epistle of Peter and commented on it. What he thought of its authenticity can only be inferred from Cassiodorus, viz. that he rejected it, as he did that of James and the third of John.

Origen refers to the epistle in several of his writings. Thus in the seventh homily on Joshua he has: 'For Peter speaks aloud through the two trumpets of his epistles.'[2] In the fourth homily on Leviticus: 'And again Peter says, "And ye are made partakers of a divine nature."'[3] In the thirteenth homily on the book of Numbers, speaking of Balaam, 'And as Scripture says in a certain place, "The dumb ass speaking with man's voice reproved the madness of the prophet."'[4] These testimonies of Origen are suspicious, because they are only in Rufinus's Latin translation. It is known that Rufinus took the liberty of adding to Origen's words, especially in the homilies. In his commentary on John, Origen styles Peter's first 'the catholic epistle;' but he does not so name the second. Eusebius has also given an extract, in which the Alexandrian father says, 'Peter has left one epistle universally acknowledged. Perhaps also a second, for it is doubted.'[5]

[1] *Cod.* 109.

[2] 'Petrus enim duabus epistolarum suarum personat tubis.' In libr. Jesu Nave. *Opp.* tom. ii. p. 442, ed. de la Rue.

[3] 'Et iterum Petrus dicit, Consortes, inquit, facti estis divinæ naturæ.' *Opp.* tom. ii. p. 200.

[4] 'Et ut ait quodam in loco scriptura: Mutum animal humana voce respondens, arguit prophetæ dementiam.'—*Ibid.* p. 321.

[5] *H. E.* vi. 25.

This passage is scarcely consistent with the extract from his seventh homily on Joshua, or with the quotations in which Origen speaks as if he had no doubt of the second epistle's authenticity. If he accepted the letter as Peter's why did he not use it in support of his doctrines, instead of resorting to inferential arguments? Is it not remarkable that there is no quotation of the epistle as Peter's, in all his Greek works? The dialogue *De recta fide*, current under the name Adamantius, is generally believed not to be his. It is therefore likely that Rufinus, his Latin translator, inserted the phrases in his homilies, which do not agree with Origen's own statement given by Eusebius. This view is confirmed by the fact, that Hilary of Poitiers, who followed Origen closely and adopted his canon, has not used the epistle. We must therefore hold, that though Origen knew our epistle, he did not think it Peter's.

In his extant epistle to Cyprian Firmilian of Cæsarea in Cappadocia writes: 'Abusing also the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, as if they had delivered this doctrine; though in their epistles they have anathematised heretics, and admonished us to avoid them.'[1] Here the author speaks of epistles, and seems to allude to 2 Peter especially. Yet one cannot help wishing with Lardner, that we had this letter in its original language. Cyprian to whom it was addressed has observed a total silence respecting the epistle before us.

It is not in the old Syriac version, nor was it admitted into its MSS. till a late date. The earliest MS. in the British Museum containing it, is dated A.D. 823. It is remarkable therefore, that Ephrem received it. Can we trust the text of his Greek works? Is there no cause for supposing that it was adapted here and

[1] 'Adhuc etiam infamans Petrum et Paulum beatos apostolos quasi hoc ipsi tradiderint; qui in epistolis suis hæreticos execrati sunt, et ut eos evitemus monuerunt.'—*In Cypriani oper.* ep. xxv., ed. Paris, 1726.

there to the views of the Greek church? The Syrian church generally rejected the epistle.

There is some likeness to 2 Peter i. 21 in one passage of Hippolytus's writings: 'For the prophets did not speak by their own power, nor did they preach what they wished themselves; but, in the first place, they were truly enlightened by the word; then they were taught by visions respecting future events, and being so influenced they uttered things revealed to them alone by God.'[1] It is not certain that 2 Peter suggested these words. Mayerhoff supposes that they were taken from Philo.

In Methodius, bishop of Tyre, we have the following: 'For the whole world, that it may be purified and renewed, will be burned up with devouring flames.'[2] In another place he writes: 'Wherefore it is necessary that both earth and heaven exist again, after the conflagration of all things and the fervent heat.'[3] It is likely that such passages in the epistle as iii. 6, 7, 12, 13, floated before the mind of Methodius, but there is no proper citation.

Eusebius writes: 'One epistle of Peter, called his first, is universally received. This the elders of ancient times have quoted in their writings as undoubtedly authentic. But that called his second epistle, we have been informed, has not been received into the canon. Nevertheless, appearing to many useful, it has been carefully studied with the other scriptures.'[4] Else-

[1] *οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἰδίας δυνάμεως ἐφθέγγοντο (οἱ προφῆται . . . . οὐδὲ ἅπερ αὐτοὶ ἐβούλοντο ταῦτα ἐκήρυττον, ἀλλὰ πρῶτον μὲν διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐσοφίζοντο ὀρθῶς, ἔπειτα δι' ὁραμάτων προεδιδάσκοντο τὰ μέλλοντα καλῶς· εἶθ' οὕτω πεπεισμένοι ἔλεγον ταῦτα, ἅπερ αὐτοῖς ἦν μόνοις ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένα.—De Antichristo*, c. 2.

[2] *ἐκπυρωθήσεται γὰρ πρὸς κάθαρσιν καὶ ἀνακαινισμὸν καταβάς, ᾧ πᾶς (ἅπας?) ὁ κόσμος κατακλυζόμενος πυρί.—Apud Epiphan. Hæres.* lxiv. 31.

[3] *διὸ ἀνάγκη δὴ καὶ τὴν γῆν αὖθις, καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν μετὰ τὴν ἐκφλόγωσιν ἔσεσθαι πάντων, καὶ τὸν βρασμόν.—Ibid.*

[4] *Πέτρου μὲν οὖν ἐπιστολὴ μία ἡ λεγομένη αὐτοῦ προτέρα ἀνωμολόγηται· ταύτῃ δὲ καὶ οἱ πάλαι πρεσβύτεροι ὡς ἀναμφιλέκτῳ ἐν τοῖς σφῶν αὐτῶν κατακέ-*

where he states that 2 Peter belonged to the controverted writings.[1] These passages of Eusebius show that he did not believe in the epistle's authenticity. He speaks of it in cautious terms, and puts it among the controverted books. Many before him did not admit its canonical authority, though it was read in public for edification.

At the end of his commentary on the epistle Didymus says: 'It should not be concealed that the present epistle has been considered a forged one, and though it has been published it is not in the canon.'[2] The epistle was reckoned spurious by various persons, among whom was Didymus himself. But the same writer elsewhere cites the epistle as *Petrine* and *catholic*, and speaks of *the first* epistle of Peter, implying a second.[3] The language here attributed to him was probably added to his explanation of the epistle by a later hand.

Jerome says: 'Simon Peter wrote two epistles, which are called catholic; the second of which most persons deny to be his, on account of its disagreement in style with the first.'[4]

In another place he explains the difference of language and style by the fact that Peter employed a different *interpreter* in the case of the second.[5]

After Jerome, the epistle was received by Rufinus, Augustine, Basil, Gregory, Palladius, Hilary, Ambrose, and others, and was reckoned an essential part of the

χρηνται συγγράμμασιν· τὴν δὲ φερομένην αὐτοῦ δευτέραν, οὐκ ἐνδιάθηκον μὲν εἶναι παρειλήφαμεν, ὅμως δὲ πολλοῖς χρήσιμος φανεῖσα, μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἐσπουδάσθη γραφῶν.—H. E. iii. 3.

[1] *Ibid.* iii. 25.

[2] 'Non est igitur ignorandum, præsentem epistolam esse falsatam, quæ licet publicetur, non tamen in canone est.'—*In Gallandi Biblioth. Patr.* tom. vi. p. 294.

[3] *De Trinitate*, lib. i. 32, p. 9; ii. 7, p. 182; iii. 3, p. 340, ed. Mingarelli.

[4] 'Scripsit (Petrus) duas epistolas quæ catholicæ nominantur, quarum secunda a plerisque ejus esse negatur, propter styli cum priore dissonantiam.' —*De Script. Eccles.* c. 1.

[5] *Epist. cxx. ad Hedib.* cap. ii. vol. i. p. 1002, ed. Migne.

canon. Chrysostom's testimony is doubtful, since he has but one uncertain quotation from the epistle (ii. 22).[1]

From this review of the patristic evidence we learn, that the first *certain* trace of the epistle is at Alexandria in Clement's works. As far as the history of it can be investigated, it is always found in connection with the other catholic ones. Origen and Eusebius put it among the books not received. The council of Laodicea (A.D. 363) decided in favour of Peter's two epistles. So too Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, and probably Epiphanius. But doubts of its authenticity still lingered in the Eastern church, for Gregory of Nazianzus states, that some received *three*, others seven, catholic epistles. Didymus is a prominent exception in the fourth century to the reception of the epistle.

In the Western church there is no express notice of the epistle till Philastrius of Brescia received it into his canon, towards the close of the fourth century. It was also adopted by the third council of Carthage, A.D. 397. Cyprian in the third century speaks of but one epistle of Peter; and the Muratorian canon makes no reference to a second. Irenæus and Tertullian are unacquainted with it. But Jerome adopted it, and from his time it was generally admitted.

The early Syrian church was adverse to its authenticity. Ephrem admitted the seven catholic epistles, influenced without doubt by the Greek church. The later Syriac version also received the seven. Theodore of Mopsuestia rejected it, if we believe Leontius of Byzantium. Junilius also relates that the authenticity of second Peter, second and third John, James and Jude were not admitted in the Syriac school at Nisibis, though he says that the five were received 'by very many.' Cosmas Indicopleustes the Egyptian monk bears similar testimony to the Syrian canon,

[1] *Homil. in Joann.* 34, vol. viii. p. 197, ed. Migne.

stating that it had but three catholic epistles. He himself regards the epistle as doubtful, probably on doctrinal grounds. But his language respecting the catholic letters is vague and incorrect.

How then does external evidence affect the authenticity? Distinguished men like Origen and Eusebius did not receive the letter as Peter's. What induced them to treat it so? Were their reasons critical, doctrinal, or historical? When Jerome says that its authenticity was denied by *most*, the expression implies that it had many opponents, if not in his own, at least in the preceding time. The external evidence does not prove that Peter wrote the letter, but is rather unfavourable to it. All that it shows is one fact of importance, viz. that the treatise existed before the time of Clemens Alexandrinus; how long it is impossible to tell. Though the silence of the early fathers is not a conclusive argument against its authenticity or existence, it excites doubts.

Internal evidence is stronger than the external against the epistle's authenticity.

1. Jude is copied or imitated by Peter; a fact inconsistent with the position and character of an apostle. The former was not an apostle. Is it likely that Peter would follow his letter as he has done? Had Jude been an apostle, Peter might perhaps have adopted his sentiments and words, but even in that case it would be improbable.

The force of this argument is not weakened by asserting that the use made of another's writing appears in the description of the opponents only; that Peter, finding the principal features of errorists given by Jude, adopted them with impulsive readiness; and that he expressly puts himself on an equality with all believers at the beginning of the epistle, while he mentions his apostolic office (2 Peter i. 1). The question is, Would he borrow even so much from one not an apostle, and subordinate his individuality. Without transferring

modern ideas of literary propriety to apostolic times, or denying that the apostles were free from desire to give prominence to their literary personality, we maintain the improbability of an apostle being so far dependent on one who was not, as to copy ii. 4–iii. 1, and with alterations too which are not improvements.

2. There is a visible anxiety on the part of the author to identify himself with the apostle Peter. Thus in i. 1 he uses the double name, Simon Peter. He has a threefold allusion to his death (i. 13, 14, 15). In i. 16–18, he refers to the transfiguration on the mount, wishing to show that he was present. In iii. 1, he identifies himself with the author of the first epistle; and in iii. 15 he wishes to appear as an apostle. A self-prominent air and conscious effort are visible. 'I will not be negligent to put you always in remembrance of these things.' 'I think it meet to stir you up,' etc. 'I will endeavour that ye may be able after my decease,' etc. 'In both which I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance.' The language is an echo of Jude's. 'I gave all diligence to write unto you . . . . it was needful for me to write unto you.' 'I will, therefore, put you in remembrance.' These expressions are hardly consistent with the conscious authority of an apostle.

An attempt has been made to weaken this argument by bringing the author's references to self into connection with the urgent character of his polemics, and the endeavour to give prominence to the certainty of apostolic tradition in opposition to doubters, so that all passages in which the personality of Peter appears more or less plainly may be accounted for by one or other of these two considerations. The attempt is far-fetched. Had the apostleship of the author been attacked, we might readily admit the propriety of his solicitude to pass for Peter, as Paul insisted on his apostolic authority when it was assailed by false teachers; but in the absence of official depreciation, his polemics did not need

repeated indications of Petrine authorship. And if the certainty of apostolic tradition had to be upheld, was Peter's name not sufficient? Surely the writer, if Peter himself, would have so reckoned it. The fact that he did not deem it sufficient, but appealed also to 'the holy prophets and apostles,' as well as to the 'beloved brother Paul,' militates against the second reason assigned for the writer's carefulness to make himself known, viz. the endeavour to give prominence to the certainty of apostolic tradition. It was enough for Peter to make statements on his own authority, without resorting to Paul's name for corroboration.

3. The allusion to an apostolic commandment (iii. 2), where the writer plainly distinguishes himself from the apostles, argues another writer than Peter. Forgetting that Jude, in saying 'the apostles of our Lord' (17), wrote correctly because he was not himself an apostle, the author borrows the words; but unconsciously lays aside his assumed character while writing, 'the commandment of your apostles of the Lord and Saviour.'

There is a difference of reading in the passage;[1] but the construction is awkward whichever be adopted. The original of Jude is easy; the copy not so. An apostle would hardly express his meaning so clumsily.

4. The citation of Paul's epistles under the title of 'Scriptures,'[2] betrays a post-apostolic age: 'And account that the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you; as also in all his epistles speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction' (iii. 15, 16).

Admitting that a collection of *all* Paul's epistles is not implied here, but only of such as were known to the

[1] ὑμῶν and ἡμῶν. [2] γραφαί.

writer and his time, it is obviously meant that the epistles were classed among *the sacred writings*, or that they had then attained to canonical authority. The more important Pauline letters are classed with the other New Testament writings, and both styled *Scriptures*; a term always applied to the Old Testament in the apostolic epistles. The elevation of Paul's epistles to the title and authority of *Scripture* belongs to a post-apostolic time.

5. The mount of transfiguration is called 'the *holy* mount' (i. 18), which points to a time when superstitious reverence had sprung up for places in Palestine. The writer states that he was an eyewitness of Christ's majesty on the mountain, in order to confirm the minds of his readers in the certainty of the second advent. Why does he not appeal to the discourses of Jesus himself respecting his future manifestation, as they are recorded in the synoptics? The reason of his silence respecting them appears to be that Christ's coming had not taken place in the way of the synoptic discourses, viz. immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem. Events had not verified the second coming as reported; and therefore the writer omits all reference to the synoptic declarations of Christ. We are thus guided to one who wrote some time after the destruction of Jerusalem; a fact which excludes Peter's authorship.

6. The author is conscious of a distinction between canonical and apocryphal works, so that he is averse to quote an apocryphal book or narrative, and omits the book of Enoch, with the dispute between the archangel Michael and the devil. Compelled to change, his text is obscure without the comment furnished by Jude (comp. 2 Peter ii. 4, 11, with Jude 14).

7. There is a reference to doubts about the second coming of Christ occasioned by the disappointed expectation of its speedy occurrence, which point to a later than the apostolic period. Those who denied or

doubted the second advent exclaimed, 'Where is the promise of his coming? For since the fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.' No men of this sort could have troubled the apostolic age; nor could such doubts have been expressed till after the destruction of Jerusalem, which was supposed to be the immediate prelude of the second coming.

It is incorrect to say with Olshausen, that the heretics do not advance their own sentiment but ridicule the belief of the primitive Christians and instead of doubting merely scoff. After a generation had passed they could say, the fathers are fallen asleep, and all things continue as they were from the beginning.

8. The author speaks of *the day of God* or *of the Lord* (iii. 10, 12), which he considers as near, i.e. *the day of judgment*, in which the heavens and the earth are to be destroyed. The hope of Christ's appearance entertained by the apostles and early Christians is not expressed. The writer of the epistle puts the *day of God* in its place. This unapostolic idea shows a late time, excludes the millennium of the Apocalypse, and involves the abandonment of expectations connected with the destruction of Jerusalem. The conception and phraseology belong to the second century.

Along with this should be taken the author's statement in the 1st chapter, 'we have not followed cunningly devised fables when we made known unto you the power and *coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ' (verse 16), where he throws himself back into the time of Peter personally instructing the readers to whom he writes, and attests the second coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is implied to be future. The passages are inconsistent, the author apparently forgetting in the 3rd chapter what he had intimated before. In the one case he unconsciously lays aside his personation of Peter; in the other, it is maintained. Some may

think perhaps that *God* or *Lord* in connection with day (iii. 9, 10, 12) means Christ; an opinion which would be favoured by i. 1, according to the usual rule of grammar (our God and Saviour Jesus Christ); but it is safer to follow the second verse of the 1st chapter, where God and Jesus are distinguished. It is a sufficient refutation of those who cite such passages as iii. 8, 9, 10, to show that the persuasion expressed in them is the same as that in 1 Peter iv. 5, and therefore that the writers of the epistles are identical, to state, that the first letter identifies the day of judgment with the Lord's coming, Christ being the judge; whereas the second epistle drops all mention of Christ's coming in iii. 8–10, and speaks of God (not Christ) as judge in the great day.

9. The author assumes that he is writing to the same churches as in the former epistle (iii. 1). But what he says is inconsistent with that assumption, for according to the second epistle he must have instructed them personally. The churches addressed in the first epistle could not stand in the same relation to the author of the second: '*We made known unto you* the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ' (i. 16); words which refuse to be explained away by a figure:[1] nor does the verb *we made known* refer to the first epistle, but to personal instruction.

Again, the salutation in the first verse implies that the letter is a general one intended for all Christians. The sixteenth verse of the same chapter contracts the relation between writer and readers. Afterwards the circle is limited to those whom Paul had addressed (iii. 15), i.e. to the believers in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia (iii. 1, compared with 1 Peter i. 1). The passage in iii. 15 states that Paul in all his epistles spoke to them 'of these things,' viz. of the future ap-

[1] That called *ἀνακοίνωσις* or communicatio, in which the speaker or writer includes others with himself,

pearance of Christ. Where did Paul write about that event to the believers in the five provinces mentioned? Not in the epistle to the Galatians which contains no suitable passages respecting Christ's future advent. De Wette suggests that our author may have assumed that every Pauline letter was intended for all Christians, in which case the reference may be to the first Thessalonian epistle (iv. 13–v. 11). The ingenious conjecture presupposes a post-apostolic idea, viz. that the apostolic epistles were intended for all Christians.

10. The word properly translated *heresy* (ii. 1) has not this sense in the New Testament elsewhere. During the apostolic time it meant nothing but *a division* or *sect*; its application to doctrine was post-apostolic. The author who appeals elsewhere to *the holy commandment* or *the commandment of the apostles*, can consistently speak of 'heresies of destruction' (ii. 1), attaching an importance to apostolic doctrine which did not arise till the second century.

11. The difference of diction and style between the first epistle and the present argues a different authorship, disproving the latter's Petrine origin.

The following particulars may be specified.

(*a.*) The epistle is distinguished by a poverty of language, which is shown in drawling and tedious repetitions. Thus the preposition *by*[1] with the genitive occurs three times, in i. 3, 4. The word *destruction*[2] is three times, in ii. 1–3. The adjective *just* or *righteous*[3] occurs three times in ii. 7, 8. In ii. 12 the same noun *corruption*[4] appears twice with a cognate verb besides. In iii. 12–14, the same verb *expect*[5] is found three times. Compare also the noun *diligence* and its related verb *to be diligent*,[6] in i. 5, 10, 15. A similar repetition of words is in iii. 10–12. There is also uniformity in the way of attaching verses to preceding ones; for which purpose

[1] διά. [2] ἀπώλεια. [3] δίκαιος.
[4] φθορά, φθείρειν. [5] προσδοκᾶν. [6] σπουδή, σπουδάζειν.

the pronoun *these* is much used (i. 4, 8, 10, 12; iii. 11, 14, 16).

(*b.*) The epistles differ in their use of the words *Lord* and *God*.[1] The former is applied to Christ in the first epistle, except in quotations; in the second it always designates God the Father, except *Christ* or *Saviour* be added. The first epistle has often the name *Christ* by itself as well as with *Jesus*; the second never has it, except with attendant predicates. *God* occurs very often in the first epistle, nearly forty times; in the second, seldom.

The author of the latter epistle is fond of applying the epithet *Saviour*[2] to Jesus; which does not appear in the first. It is impossible to account for this diversity by the differing occasion and object. The different realms of thought in the two epistles will not explain it on the assumption of one writer. Far-fetched attempts have been made to account for the distinction; but they are the fancies of modern theologians. What for instance can be more improbable than to suppose that the writer of the first epistle dropped Christ's lordly titles, and adduced his office (Christ), or his combined person and office (Jesus Christ, Christ Jesus), because he wished to encourage his readers by community of suffering and glorification with their head; while he reminded the readers of the second of Christ's lordship (lord) and saving power (Saviour), because he had in view warning and caution against rebellion? Is not the assumption refuted by the application of *lord* to Christ in the first epistle (i. 3; ii. 3, 13); as well as by the usual accompaniment *Jesus Christ* or *Jesus*, to *Lord* and *Saviour* in the second epistle? The supposition is gratuitous.

(*c.*) Different words are employed to denote the second coming. The second epistle has one term[3] (i. 16; iii. 4); the first another.[4]

[1] Κύριος and Θεός. [2] σωτήρ. [3] παρουσία. [4] ἀποκάλυψις.

(*d.*) The Christian religion is differently designated. In the first epistle we find *hope* (i. 3 ; iii. 15),[1] *grace* (i. 10, 13 ; v. 12),[2] *the truth* (i. 22),[3] *the word* (ii. 8 ; iii. 1),[4] *the faith* (v. 9),[5] *the gospel of God* (iv. 17).[6] The second has, *the way* of truth (ii. 2),[7] *the way of righteousness* (ii. 21,)[8] *the holy commandment* (ii. 21),[9] *the commandment of the apostles* (iii. 2).[10]

(*e.*) The epistles differ in citing from the Old Testament, of which the first makes much more use than the second. In the one we have, *because it is written*[11] (i. 16), *wherefore it is contained in the Scripture* (ii. 6),[12] as introductory formulas, which do not occur in the other. Or, the first epistle weaves the Old Testament expressions into the narrative, as if they were familiar to the author's mind (i. 1, 24, 25 ; ii. 2–5, 7, 9, 10, 22–25 ; iii. 9–12, 14, 15 ; iv. 18) ; a peculiarity less conspicuous in the second.

(*f.*) There is a peculiar use of the particle *as*[13] in the first epistle, implying quality, character, circumstance (i. 14, 19 ; ii. 2, 11–14, 16 ; iii. 7, 16 ; iv. 10–12, 15, 16, 19 ; v. 3). In the second epistle it is commonly used for comparison, except in i. 3 ; iii. 16 ; (i. 19 ; ii. 1, 12 ; iii. 8, 9, 10, 16). The word occurs very often in the first epistle ; seldomer in the second, and usually in another way.

(*g.*) In the second epistle a subordinate clause is frequently formed by means of the preposition *in* and a substantive, as in i. 4.[14] Comp. ii. 3, 7, 10, 13, 18 ; iii. 1, 3. This peculiarity does not appear in the first epistle, except perhaps in i. 14.

(*h.*) The style of the first epistle is fresh, lively, periodic ; that of the second, flat, heavy, and cold.

The second epistle has a large number of words

[1] ἐλπίς. [2] χάρις. [3] ἀλήθεια. [4] λόγος.
[5] πίστις. [6] εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. [7] ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας.
[8] ὁδὸς τῆς δικαιοσύνης. [9] ἁγία ἐντολή. [10] ἐντολὴ τῶν ἀποστόλων.
[11] διότι γέγραπται. [12] διὸ περιέχει ἐν τῇ γραφῇ. [13] ὡς.
[14] τῆς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς.

peculiar to itself; the first has fewer distinctive terms.

Several critics adduce phrases, words, and ideas common to both, in order to lessen the discrepancy of style. Here Windischmann, Dietlein, Brückner and Schott labour to show as much unity as possible. Thus it is alleged that both epistles refer to ancient prophecy (1 Peter i. 11; 2 Peter i. 20, 21); that both use *virtue* (1 Peter ii. 9; 2 Peter i. 3); that both have the term rendered *putting away*[1] (1 Peter iii. 21; 2 Peter i. 14), which occurs nowhere else in the New Testament; but the relation of these words are different in the epistles. The term *truth*[2] is in both (1 Peter i. 22; 2 Peter i. 12; ii. 2), which is far from remarkable; and the verb *receive*[3] occurs in them (1 Peter i. 9; v. 4; 2 Peter ii. 13), which is used by Paul. The two adjectives *spotless* and *blameless*[4] are nearly the same in both (1 Peter i. 19; 2 Peter iii. 14); and the verb *to behold* (1 Peter ii. 12; iii. 2) corresponds to the noun *eyewitness* in 2 Peter i. 16.[5] The expression *has ceased from sin* (1 Peter iv. 1) is said not to be unlike *that cannot cease from sin* (2 Peter ii. 14).[6] These analogies have nothing remarkable, since the writer of the second epistle must have known the first. The use of the word *own*[7] (1 Peter iii. 5; 2 Peter i. 3; ii. 16; iii. 17), and the omission of the article before certain words (comp. 1 Peter ii. 13, with 2 Peter i. 21),[8] are too trifling to have any weight. After a careful sifting of the similarities and differences, the latter are so conspicuous as to excite a strong presumption against identity of authorship. Had a few peculiarities been observable, they might have been satisfactorily explained; but they are numerous. We cannot account for them on the supposition that both

[1] ἀπόθεσις. [2] ἀλήθεια. [3] κομίζειν.
[4] ἄσπιλος and ἄμωμος. [5] ἐποπτεύειν to ἐπόπτης.
[6] πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας, ἀκαταπαύστους ἁμαρτίας. [7] ἴδιος.
[8] Before βασιλεῖ in the one and θελήματι in the other.

letters came from one writer. That task must be left to critics like Schott, who brings out to his own satisfaction a correspondence between the two epistles, in matter, language, and peculiarities, showing that they must have proceeded from Peter, at a year's interval. If he concedes a few differences of style between the letters, as in chapters i. 12–ii., they are attributed to an outburst of Peter's natural mode of speech, especially in reference to adversaries; whereas in writing to Gentile Christians who had been instructed by Paul, the apostle employs a carefully elaborated diction. In other words, his natural temperament is the cause of his writing careless Greek at times.[1]

(*i.*) The opponents described in Jude's epistle as existing, are here represented in the spirit of prophecy as about to appear. But while the future tense is used in ii. 1–3, the present is employed in subsequent verses of the same chapter (10–15). Thus the time varies; the persons described being sometimes future, sometimes present. This alternation obscures the description, making it vague and indefinite.

The only rational explanation of the fact is the position of the author, who, while drawing the features of individuals from his own time, was also throwing himself back into the past, and speaking for Peter in the spirit of prophecy. Thus the future is intersected by the present. From a present basis the author describes a post-apostolic future.

Analogous examples confirm this view, and corroborate the argument directed against the epistle's authenticity. The epistles to Timothy describe heretics dimly both as future and present—Gnostics existing and to be. (Comp. 1 Tim. iv. 1 with vi. 20; 2 Tim. iii. 1 with iii. 8.) Apologists endeavour to explain this fact in ways conservative of the epistle's authenticity; but Brückner himself pronounces them unsatisfactory,

[1] *Der Zweite Brief Petri, u. s. w.*, p. 187.

without furnishing any lucid solution of the difficulty. The colours in which the author paints his opponents are shifting, because he wrote in the name of Peter, about future deceivers existing in his own day. Hence the indistinctness of time and persons.

These internal considerations go far to disprove the epistle's authenticity, and, with the external evidence, are very strong. The Petrine origin cannot be maintained in the face of them. The letter may or may not be worthy of Peter; its general tone and spirit are post-apostolical. That it contains valuable matter we freely admit. It is also clear, that the author had read both Jude and first Peter; that he possessed some literary independence, and was not without originality. Yet the breath of apostolic inspiration does not animate the composition; the ideas are not unfrequently obscure; and the construction of sentences is difficult and awkward.[1] The aqueous origin of the earth and its future destruction by fire, is a view half mythical, half scientific. The idea of *hastening* the day of judgment, i.e. by repentance and holiness, so as to render God's long-suffering unnecessary, is singular (iii. 12). That things subserving life and godliness are the means of imparting a divine nature to Christians, is neither Pauline nor apostolic (i. 3, 4).

Apologists determined to uphold the Petrine authorship—and there are still some conservative critics like Thiersch and Weiss, although Erasmus and Calvin doubted it—persist in speaking of the work as a *forgery* if it be not the apostle's. Early Christian writers often wrote in the name of others, with good motives. The thing was common; so that contemporaries could not condemn what they approved of. While therefore we admit that there was no probable motive for *a forgery*,

[1] Compare i. 15 *σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ ἑκάστοτε ἔχειν ὑμᾶς μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον, τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι*; also the three introductory clauses in ii. 4–6 without an apodosis, etc.

neither personal ambition nor ecclesiastical claims ; the author had a motive for writing the letter which satisfied his own mind. By personating an apostle he hoped to give currency to his exhortations, and make them productive of beneficial results. The means were thought harmless ; the end desirable. If these remarks be just, they neutralise the arguments founded on forgers being careful not to overthrow their own fabrics by falling into inconsistencies. The fact that they were not scrupulously solicitous about preserving their assumed identity shows an unconsciousness of wrong-doing in the matter.

ORIGINAL READERS.

The first verse implies that the epistle was addressed to Christians generally, i.e. that it is encyclical. But iii. 1 shows that the writer had in view the same persons to whom the first was sent, those to whom Paul had written, i.e. the believers in Asia Minor, where the churches were composed mainly of Gentile Christians. It would also appear from i. 16, that the writer had instructed them personally. Other phenomena make the identity of the churches to which the epistles were sent very doubtful. The first contains no trace of the heretical tendency combated in the second ; and the second does not allude to the persecutions plainly indicated in the first. The reply that the interval sufficed for the development of heresies and doubts whose germs existed already, is insufficient ; as is also the assumption of the speedy cessation of persecution. Thus the identity of the churches to which the epistles are addressed is problematical. The author of the second personating Peter intimates their identity; the situation of the readers, as far as the epistles themselves show, suggests another conclusion. In any case, the persons addressed in the second are vaguely characterised, being spoken of with

reference to the apostolic commandment (i. 1, 16), or to the opponents condemned (i. 12 ; iii. 17). The circumstances in which the author stood account for the indefiniteness overhanging the churches he addresses. While intimating their identity with those of the first epistle he throws in no distinct notices to impair it and the assumed authorship at the same time.

THE ERRORISTS OF THE EPISTLE.

It is difficult to describe the false teachers and vicious persons to whom the epistle refers, because their features are not clearly marked. Their delineation is vague and shifting. Those to whom the second and third chapters refer were probably identical, the false teachers of the one, and the mockers of the other. Their errors were both theoretical and practical. They denied the Lord that bought them; reviled spiritual beings, especially Satan; spoke evil of angelic dignities, and railed at what was above their comprehension. They also derided the Christian belief of the second advent. In conduct they were impure, sensual, lewd, carnal, sacrificing the cause of truth to their selfish ends by artful pretences. They had a reckless covetousness. Their eloquence was pompous and empty, imposing on the credulous. They spoke great swelling words of vanity, preaching a false freedom while they themselves were slaves to corruption. It is also intimated that they had once been professors of Christianity, but had apostatised ; and that their practices were worse than those they had indulged in before joining the Christians. Who were they ? Probably Gnostics, of whom a large class were antinomian, and indulged in sensuality. All the traits specified cannot be found in any particular sect of the Gnostics, but may be traced in anti-Jewish Gnosticism generally. Their conceptions of angels, æons, and the demiurge or world-creator, were essen-

tially connected with evil-speaking about dignities. Certain angels were raised to the rank of creators; who were considered rebels against the supreme creator.

The opponents so strongly condemned are sometimes spoken of as future, sometimes as present; and the expressions applied to them are occasionally obscure. The description of them is taken from Jude's, which is easier and clearer. The free-thinking Gnosticism of Jude's epistle is described here in stronger terms, and is downright heresy. The doubts entertained refer to the return of Christ; which these Gnostics denied because it had been so long delayed. In the former epistle, the separation of the errorists from church association is an object to be attained; here it is a thing accomplished.

OBJECT AND TIME.

The author's object is somewhat obscure. Fearing the influence of false prophets and mockers, he wished to confirm Christians in their apostolic faith, to warn them against heretics, and to counsel preparation for the day of the Lord. Doubters and scoffers had appeared denying the second advent. As the churches were threatened with the pernicious leaven of these heretics, he intended to establish them in the truth.

Schwegler perceives a conciliatory tendency in the epistle, as though it were meant to set forth the final and lasting conciliation between the separate Petrine and Pauline tendencies; for which the critic appeals to i. 16; iii. 15, etc. This may have been part of his purpose, for Paul's writings are mentioned in a laudatory way; and the amalgamation of the Petrines and Paulines is undoubtedly implied in the epistle. But his leading object will be found most appropriately in iii. 17.

The time of writing is uncertain, because there are no clear indications of it in the letter itself. Schwegler,

after Semler, puts it at the end of the second century, chiefly because of supposed allusions to John xxi. 18 in i. 14; to the gospel of Mark in i. 12–15; and acquaintance with the pastoral epistles.[1] Mayerhoff dates it about the middle of the second century. If we knew the time of the so-called second epistle of Clement, in which there is an allusion to persons who denied the judgment, as there is in our letter, we might come nearer the time when the latter was written; but all is uncertain. We are inclined to date our epistle later than the second of Clement. If the latter preceded 160 A.D. as Gebhardt and Harnack suppose, the former may belong to about 170 A.D. The way in which Paul and his epistles are spoken of brings the letter into the second century if the use of Jude be not decisive on the point. One thing is clear, viz. that the epistle belongs to a period when libertine Gnosticism was acknowledged heresy. The Petrine and Pauline antagonism had disappeared; and a brotherly recognition of the apostle of the Gentiles had followed instead. The Christianity of the primitive apostles had receded before the Pauline; the two stand forth no longer in opposition, but are really harmonious; their antagonism being supposed to arise from nothing but a perverted interpretation of Paul's epistles. The last New Testament writing belongs to the atmosphere of the early catholic Church, founded in common by Peter and Paul, as was alleged.

Mayerhoff thinks that it was written in Alexandria, but his reasons are insufficient.[2] It is more likely to have been composed at Rome. The assumption of Peter's name points to this city. Schwegler has collected expressions to show the author's acquaintance with Philo and Jewish Alexandrian philosophy, but it is scarcely recognisable.

[1] *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter*, vol. i. p. 498 *et seq.*

[2] *Einleitung in die Petrinischen Schriften, u. s. w.*, p. 193 *et seq.*

INTEGRITY.

The integrity of the epistle has been needlessly disturbed by conjectures. Bertholdt's notion that the 2nd chapter has been interpolated, the 1st and 3rd only being authentic, is unsupported by external authority. Ullmann's assumption is more plausible, viz. that the 1st chapter only was written by Peter, the remaining two being later. But this is also unfounded, since the 1st chapter contains preparatory references to the persons described in the 2nd and 3rd. The 'cunningly devised fables' of the sixteenth verse correspond to the 'feigned words' of the second chapter; while characteristic phrases throughout the epistle show one author. The style of the whole is uniform. Bunsen's guess that the first eight verses and concluding doxology were written by Peter, the rest by another, is improbable.[1]

CONTENTS.

The epistle may be divided into three parts, exclusive of a brief introduction, viz. chapter i. 3–21; ii.; iii.; with i. 1, 2, prefixed.

The first division contains an admonition to steadfastness and advancement in the knowledge of Christianity, that the readers may obtain ample entrance into the everlasting kingdom of God.

After the inscription and salutation, the writer having said that as the divine power has given Christians all that contributes to life and godliness, by means of the knowledge of God who calls them through glory and might, whereby He has bestowed the greatest promises, that they may be partakers of a divine nature, escaping the prevailing corruption of the world, which consists in sinful lust,—exhorts them to due

[1] *Bibelwerk*, erster Theil, Vorerinnerungen, xliv.

industry in adding one Christian virtue to another, since, if such things belonged to them abundantly, they would become active and fruitful for the knowledge of Jesus Christ. Whereas the person lacking those graces is blind, forgetting his purification from former sins. Wherefore, subjoins the author, be the more zealous to make your calling and election sure, for if you practise the virtues mentioned you will never fall, but a rich entrance will be given you into the kingdom of the Saviour (i. 3–11).

This exhortation is followed by a confirmation of the doctrine of Christ's future appearance, which the writer effects by adducing his own testimony as that of an eye-witness, and by Old Testament prophecy. He considers it his duty to remind them of the truth of the gospel during the short remainder of his life, and endeavours to make them remember it after his decease. He and other apostles were credible preachers of Christ's advent, since they were eyewitnesses of his glorification on the holy mountain ; and besides, prophets testified of the same event. We have, he says, the word of prophecy confirmed, to which ye do well to take heed, knowing that no prophecy admits of a solution peculiar to its utterer. It cannot be explained exclusively from the prophet himself, but from its real author (i. 12–21).

The 2nd chapter refers to false teachers who were to appear, describing their godless procedure and certain punishment.

The writer states, that as there existed false prophets in the days of the true, so there should arise false teachers introducing destructive heresies, denying the Lord who redeemed them and bringing on themselves speedy destruction. Many will be seduced by them from the way of truth. They will traffic in Christianity for the glutting of their avarice. But God's vengeance does not sleep. For if He did not spare the sinning angels, but hurled them into the abyss with chains of darkness to

be reserved for punishment—if He did not spare the old world but destroyed the whole human race except Noah and seven others—if He condemned the cities of Sodom and Gomorrha, but preserved righteous Lot who had to suffer from the impious conduct of the lawless; if such be the past records of divine justice, God has ways of delivering the pious out of their trials, and reserving the ungodly to the day of judgment; especially those lusting after strange flesh with unclean desires, daring, self-willed persons, who are not afraid to slander angelic dignities; while good angels themselves, who are superior to them, do not venture to bring railing accusations against those dignities. Yet these persons revile what they do not understand, and run headlong to destruction. But they will receive the reward of their iniquity. The passing luxury of the world they count pleasure; spots and blemishes, they riot in their deceptions while they feast with Christians; having sensual eyes that never cease from sin, enticing unstable souls, with a heart practised in covetousness, cursed children. Like Balaam they have left the right way, loving unrighteous gain. As wells without water and clouds driven by tempest, they disappoint. But their end will be the blackness of darkness. Making empty, idle pretensions, they entice by fleshly lusts those who have really escaped from such as are entangled in error, promising freedom while they are slaves to corruption. When they have escaped the polluting influences of the world by the knowledge of Jesus Christ, and are again overcome by those influences, their last state is worse than the first. Better not to know the path of righteousness, than, knowing it, to turn again from the holy law of God (ii.).

The third division is directed against scoffers, in opposition to whom it is asserted that the day of judgment will come suddenly. They are represented as

saying, 'Where is his promised coming, for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation?' In opposition to these doubts, he refers to the destruction of the old world by the flood, showing that all things have not continued as they were from the beginning; and declares that one day is the same as a thousand years in the view of the Lord; so that nothing militates against the event from its being delayed (iii. 1–10).

He admonishes his readers to prepare for that solemn day, affirming that the delay is merely an evidence of God's long suffering, as the apostle Paul had written to them; though in the truths revealed about the end of the world and the general judgment, there are inherent difficulties, which the unlearned and unstable distort to their ruin (iii. 11–16).

The epistle concludes with a solemn caution, an exhortation to grow in grace, and a doxology to Christ (iii. 17, 18).

OBSERVATIONS ON THE DOCTRINAL IDEAS OF PETER'S EPISTLES.

It has been intimated that the leading ideas of both Petrine epistles are Pauline; but not specifically polemic Paulinism. The same high import is attached to the death of Christ; which is viewed, however, in a manner much nearer that of the epistle to the Hebrews. The blood of Jesus has a *purifying* power. Men are redeemed not so much from the guilt and punishment of sin as from itself—from all the sinfulness attaching to the past life. By the resurrection of Christ they have access to God, and in consequence of baptism appear before Him with a good conscience (1 Peter iii. 18, 21). The Pauline universalism of the epistles is unmistakable.

At the same time, a Jewish Christian character is

discernible. The Spirit of Christ is said to have dwelt in the prophets of the Old Testament, whose predictions implied a special knowledge of what was to be fulfilled in Christianity. Christians are the genuine theocratic people, a holy nation, a royal priesthood. Stress is laid on practical Christianity, and Pauline justification is not mentioned. Good works, the virtues that appear in the life, are prominently enjoined. In this respect the first epistle resembles that of James. So also the principle of regeneration is the *word of God*, not Christ or the Spirit. Paul's mystical union of the believer with Christ gives place to the moral efficacy of the divine word, determining the will and making a new creature. Thus a combining tendency appears in them. Paulinism and Petrinism meet. Faith and works together are the keynote, without one-sided prominence of either. Both have their independent value; and one is not subordinated to the other. The spirit of the first epistle in particular is eclectic, mediating, catholic. The tendency of the second is the same; it is the union of Paulinism and Petrinism. The highest theoretical point reached, is 'the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord;' with which is joined *virtue* or *love*.

INDEX.

ABB

ABBOT, ESRA, argument founded on a quotation in Justin, ii. 337; on the relation of Basilides to the fourth gospel, 351

Aberle, on the census of Quirinius, i. 496; on a MS. prologue to the Gospel of John ii. 333

Abraham justified by faith, the doctrine as exhibited by Paul, i. 88, 131

Achaia, Corinth the capital of, i. 17; Paul's residence in, 115, 116.

Achaicus, bearer of a Corinthian letter to Paul, i. 19

Acts of the Apostles, relation of the Galatian epistle to, i. 92; comparison of the Thessalonian epistles with, 349, 350; contents, ii. 74–84; title, 84; credibility, 85; evidence of, to be derived from the contents, 85; from the general conduct and teaching of Paul, 85–90; from particulars in the book disagreeing with other writings, 90–104; the nature and form of the speeches, 104–120; from the narratives with which the speeches are connected, 120–136; its sources, 136–138; its authorship, 138; opinions of modern critics respecting, 148–153; its leading object, 154; Overbeck's view of, 159; not admissible, 159–160; its date and place of writing, 161–166; its chronology, 166, 167; state of the text, 167, 168

Acts of Pilate, quoted for the integrity of Mark's gospel, i. 575; bearing on the authorship and date of John's gospel, ii. 362–365; opinions respecting, 363, 364; relation between them and the Hypomnemata, 364

AGA

Acts of Peter and Paul, associate the two apostles at Rome, i. 504

Adam, the first, connection between his sin and that of his posterity, i. 140–144; doctrine of original sin as exemplified and enforced by the Apostle Paul, 140 *et seq.*

Address to the Greeks, attributed to Justin Martyr, its allusion to the Galatian epistle, i. 85

Adultery, narrative of the woman taken in, ii. 427 &c.

Advent of Christ, the second, Paul preaches the, at Thessalonica, i. 8; effect of this preaching among them, 339; their supposed error on the subject, 339; antichrist to precede, 340, 341; second epistle to the Thessalonians inconsistent with Paul's belief respecting the nearness of Christ's coming, 340; animating motive in the apostolic epistles, 248; central idea of the Revelation, 282; reference to, in the second epistle of Peter, ii. 456. *See* Second Coming of Christ

Ægean and Ionian seas, Corinth situated between, i. 17

Æmilius Paulus conquers Perseus, i. 156

Æons of the Gnostics, ii. 208, 209. See Valentinus

Agape, or love-feast, abuse of the, in the Corinthian church, i. 30; how transformed in the second epistle of Peter, ii. 440

Agar and Sinai, the history and allegory of, i. 97, 98; opinion of

AGE
Marsh and Palfrey respecting the translation of Galat. iv. 24
Aged, their treatment, how spoken of, ii. 19
Albaric, his view of Jesus's mental development, ii. 302, 303
Alexander of Alexandria, quotes second epistle of John, ii. 255
Alexander the Great, temple of Artemis burnt at his birth, ii. 195
Alexander the Jew, seizure of, during the uproar at Ephesus, i. 52
Alexandria connected with Cyprus in many ways, i. 178; church at, usually allows the Pauline origin of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 188, 191; admits the canonicity of 2nd and 3rd John, ii. 255; persecutions of the Jews at, i. 226; Mark said to have founded the church at, i. 533; second epistle of Peter supposed to have been written at, ii. 468
Alexandrian philosophy and Christianity, their bearing on one another in the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 201, 204; foreign from Paulinism, 201, 202
Alexandrians, forged epistle to the, supposed to be the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 182
Alogi ascribe the Revelation to Cerinthus, i. 243; reject John's gospel, ii. 386, 387
Alphæus, father of Matthew, i. 365
Ambrose of Milan admits the Pauline origin of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 184; on the second epistle of Peter, ii. 451
Amphilochus of Iconium, reputed author of the Iambics addressed to Seleucus, admits the Pauline authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 193
Amphipolis, capital of the first division of Macedonia, i. 156
Amyntas, last prince of the Celts in Galatia, i. 70
Ananias and Sapphira, their deaths, ii. 75, 120, 121
Anastasis, supposed to be a goddess by the Athenians hearing Paul's speech, ii. 110
Andrew and Arethas, quote Papias on the Revelation, i. 241
Angels, demons, and spirits, Jewish
ANT
view of, in the Revelation, i. 267
Angels, how designated in the epistles of Jude and second Peter, ii. 440, 441.
Anger, on the place where Paul's second visit to the Corinthians should be inserted, i. 39; on the Laodicean epistle, ii. 194.
Anicetus, on the day of the Passover, ii. 372, 373
Annas, high priest, Caiaphas associated with, ii. 397; origin of the mistake in the fourth gospel, 397
Antichrist, the name occurs first in John's first epistle, i. 250; conception of, in the Revelation harmonises with apostolic times, i. 249; the representative of heathenism, in opposition to the Messiah, or of Nero, in the Revelation, 249, 290; called the Man of Sin and Son of Perdition in 2 Thessalonians, 249, 340, 341; many antichrists spoken of in Matthew xxiv. 250; false teachers, or Gnostics, the antichrists in 1 John, 250; Nero the man of sin, in 2 Thessalonians, 341; the idea originated in Judaism, especially in the book of Daniel, 342; Claudius not *the Withholder*, in 2 Thessalonians, ii. chapter, 342; the man of sin partly an ideal personage, 344; no system of religion identical with him, 344; this view consistent with inspiration, 344; Innocent III. represents the Saracens as, 300, 301; Protestants have identified antichrist and the Pope, 301. *See* second epistle to the Thessalonians
Antinomianism, Christian and Jewish, its exposure, i. 132
Antioch, martyrdom of Polycarp at, i. 9; synod of, ascribes the epistle to the Hebrews to Paul, i. 194; Luke supposed to be a native of, 435; Titus supposed to be a native of, ii. 8; Ignatius's martyrdom at, ii. 328; Trajan spends a winter there, 328
Anti-Pauline tendency, a, in the Revelation, i. 252, 253
Antitheses of Gnosis, Baur's view of, ii. 65

ANT

Antony, Mark, at the battle of Philippi, i. 157
Apocalypse, its christology, i. 248, 257; its eschatology, 247. *See* Revelation, book of
Apocalyptic tendency of Paul's preaching at Thessalonica, De Wette's supposition respecting, i. 5
Apocryphal Corinthian epistle, published in Armenian with a Latin translation by Wilkins, i. 40; Masson's publication of, 40; Fabricius's, Whiston's, Aucher, and Lord Byron's; authenticity defended by Rinck, 40, 41
Apollinaris, testimony in favour of the close relationship between Matthew's Aramæan logia and the present Greek gospel, i. 383, 384; fragments of his work on the Paschal controversy preserved by Eusebius, 373, 374; alleged doubts of their authenticity, 383, 384; on the day of the Passover, ii. 373; testifies to the existence of the fourth gospel in his time, 373
Apollonius, quotes the Revelation in opposing the Montanists, i. 242
Apollos, brings intelligence of the Corinthian church to Paul, i. 19; his party in that church, 26, 27; supposed by Luther to be the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, 216; not mentioned in the epistle, supposed reason, 221; instructed by Aquila and Priscilla, ii. 195
Apologies of Justin Martyr, written in Greek, i. 129; reminiscences in the Colossian letter, ii. 177; dates of the first apology and the dialogue with Trypho, ii. 335; Logos-doctrine of, 342–344; resembles that of the synoptists, 343, 344
Apostles, Acts of the. *See* Acts of the Apostles
Apostles and Paul, their relation to one another, i. 87, ii. 96–100
Apostolicity of Matthew's gospel, i. 386–392
Apphia, wife of Philemon, i. 150, ii. 174
Aquila, with Priscilla, driven from Rome to Corinth, i. 18, 102; Paul resides with, 18, 103; accompanies

ATH

Paul to Syria, 18; his birthplace, 102; commissioned by Paul to instruct Apollos more perfectly, ii. 195
Aramæan, the epistle to the Hebrews supposed to be written in, i. 231; Peter's native tongue, 520; language of Matthew's original gospel, 306, 413; its prevalence in Palestine, 381
Archippus, supposed to be Philemon's son, i. 150; styled by Paul his fellow-labourer, ii. 174; probably pastor of the Colossian church, 174
Aristarchus, seized by Demetrius in the uproar at Ephesus, i. 52; Paul's fellow-labourer, 105
Aristides, the rhetorician, his statement respecting Corinth, i. 17
Arnaud, defends the authenticity of Jude's epistle, ii. 271
Arnold, Matthew, his view of the discourses in the fourth gospel and their essential genuineness, vol. ii. 313, 314; his notion about the redaction of the gospel, 368, 369
Artemis, worship of, at Ephesus, ii. 195; her temple burnt by Herostratus, 195; Pliny's account of the temple, 195
As, the particle, different use in the two epistles of Peter, ii. 461
'Ascension of Moses,' supposed to be quoted by Jude, ii. 268, 269
Ascension of Jesus, the, varieties in the notices of it, ii. 295; the original view took the resurrection and ascension to be at the same time, 295
Ascension of Isaiah, the, separates the resurrection and ascension of Jesus by eighteen months, ii. 295
Asia Minor, Galatia a province of, i. 89; first epistle of John written in, ii. 245; epistle to the Colossians, supposed to be written in, 190
Asses, Matthew's gospel represents Jesus riding on two, i. 388, 389
Athanasius, receives the first epistle of John as authentic, ii. 232; also the second epistle of Peter, 452
Athenagoras, on the first epistle to the Corinthians, i. 42; Lardner's quotations of passages in, resembling some in 1 Timothy, ii. 38;

on John's gospel, 360; on the second epistle of Peter, 445
Athens, visited by Paul, i. 6, ii. 81; his speech at, 108–110
Atonement, doctrine of, in the first epistle of John not the same as in the gospel, ii. 237
Attalus, King of Pergamus, checks the Celts, i. 89
Aucher, Father, translates the apocryphal Corinthian epistles, i. 41
Augustine, on the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 184, 186; on Mark's gospel, 549; on the first epistle of John, ii. 244
Augustus, turns Galatia into a Roman province, i. 70; favours the Jews, 101; assigns them a dwelling place in Rome, 101; at the battle of Philippi, 157; his supposed census of the Roman empire, 493
Aurelius, bishop of Chollabi, appeals to 2 John 10 as the words of John the apostle, ii. 255

BABYLON, Peter's supposed residence in, i. 528; the first epistle of Peter dated from, 522; the appellation of Rome, 522, 298
Barnabas, supposed to have accompanied Paul into Galatia on a journey prior to the two visits mentioned in Acts xvi. and xviii., i. 72; to have written the epistle to the Hebrews, 177–179; a native of Cyprus, 178; meaning of the phrase 'son of exhortation,' 178; the epistle attributed to him, 179; its bearing on the epistle to the Hebrews, 228, 229; styled a catholic epistle by Origen, 302; it recognises the existence of Matthew's gospel, 416; he accompanied Mark to Cyprus, 533; his epistle does not show the use of 2 Peter, ii. 445
Basil the Great, on the Pauline origin of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 193; on the reading of Ephesians, i. 1, ii. 197; on the second epistle of Peter, ii. 451
Basilides, his 24 books on 'the gospel,' i. 447; doubtful reference to Luke's gospel, 447; supposed testimony to John's gospel, ii. 348–350. *See* Bunsen
Basilidians, rejected the pastoral epistles, ii. 40; vaguely joined with Basilides, by Hippolytus, i. 447, 448; supposed testimony to John's gospel, ii. 350, 351. *See* Bunsen
Bauer, Bruno, rejects the authenticity of the first epistle to the Corinthians, i. 41; of the second epistle to the Corinthians, 62; of the Galatian epistle, 85; of the epistle to the Romans, 116
Baumgarten, his view of Paul's allusion to the false teachers in his speech at Miletus, ii. 111
Baur, F. C., his arguments against the authenticity of the first epistle to the Thessalonians, i. 10–15; he rejects the Pauline authorship of the second epistle to the Thessalonians, 348; on the order of these two epistles, 351; his hypothesis of the Petrine and Christ parties in the Corinthian church, 22–25; on Paul's object in writing to the Romans, 113, 114; rejects the authenticity of Romans xv. and xvi. 125; questions the authenticity of the epistle to Philemon, 152; his arguments against the Pauline authorship of the epistle to the Philippians examined, 159–164; on Euodia and Syntyche, 163; his opinion about the prophecy in Matthew xxiv. 414; an argument of his against the authenticity of the pastoral epistles, ii. 37; on the first epistle of John, 243, 251; on the second and third of John, 261; thinks that John's gospel appeared in the interests of the paschal controversy, 420
Baxter, his idea of faith, i. 96
Beast with seven heads and ten horns, symbol of the, i. 290; the head represents Nero, 290; its number that of a man, 291; the succession of popes, a Protestant parallel to the number, 301
Bede, on the title of the first epistle of John, ii. 244
Beginning, the, *of the creation of God*, a designation of Christ in the

BEN

Revelation, i. 262; not a mere honorary title, 262
Bengel, supposes that James's epistle followed that of 1 Peter, i. 514
Benson, supposes that Philemon was converted by one of Paul's assistants, i. 149
Berœa, visited by Paul on his expulsion from Thessalonica, i. 5; Paul driven from, by the persecution of the Jews, 5; Onesimus, supposed bishop of, 150
Bertholdt, supposes that Paul did not write all the epistle to Philemon, i. 155; on the integrity of the second epistle of Peter, ii. 469
Bethany, the scenes at, ii. 285, 286, 322
Bethesda, cure at pool of, ii. 282
Biesenthal, holds the Aramæan original of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 231
Bishops, their character and qualifications, ii. 12, 18, 53; origin of, 53
Bithynia, part of, given to the Celts, i. 69; supposed to be the burial-place of Luke, 425
Bleek, on Paul's visits to the Corinthians, i. 38; on an epistle sent from Paul to the Corinthians by Titus, 50, 51; on the Judaisers among the Galatians, 83; on the number of the Philippian epistles, 165; his collection of patristic opinions on the epistle to the Hebrews, 194; selects twenty-two passages from Schulz to show that the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews used Philo, 219; attributes the Revelation to John the presbyter, 276; supposes that the passage in James's epistle about Rahab was received by tradition, 321; on the authorship of the Revelation, 276; on the quotations in Matthew, 421, 422; rejects the authenticity of the first epistle to Timothy, ii. 73; on John's gospel, 326, 353; uses the fact that Ptolemy and Heracleon had the fourth gospel to show that it was accepted in the time of Valentinus, 353; his view of the paschal controversy, 381–383
Blind man restored to sight, narrative of, ii. 284; illustrative of

BUT

Christ as the light of the world, ii. 284
Blom, on the date of James's epistle, i. 323; supposes that James's epistle followed the first of Peter, 514; rejects the authenticity of 1 Peter, 521
Boehmer, on the Colossian errorists, ii. 180
Boernerianus codex, the epistle to the Hebrews not in, i. 183
Bornemann, edits the Acts after D., ii. 108
Böttger, on the meaning of the word 'prætorium' in the Philippian epistle, i. 166
Bretschneider, on the passages in Origen supposed to show Celsus's acquaintance with the fourth gospel, ii. 361
Brückner, B., on James's doctrine of justification, i. 320; attempt to show the early date of James's epistle, 317, 318; on the first epistle of Peter, 512, 513; on the second epistle of Peter, ii. 462
Brückner, W., rejects the authenticity of Peter's first epistle, i. 521; supposes that James's followed it, 514
Brutus, at the battle of Philippi, i. 157
Bucer, refuses to accept the Revelation as a biblical book, i. 275
Bull, bishop, on James's doctrine of justification by works, i. 320
Bunsen, Chevalier, on Basilides and the Docetæ, ii. 348, 349; on the integrity of second epistle of Peter, 469
Burgess, on 1 John v. 7, 8; ii. 247, 248
Burgon, Dr., on Mark xvi. 9–20; i. 572, 576; defends the verses as an original part of the gospel, 577
Burton, supposes Sosthenes to be one of the bearers of the second epistle to the Corinthians, i. 58
Butler, Bishop, asserts that death is not the destruction of living agents, ii. 295
Burrus, the prefect, his death, i. 168
Bush, on the new heavens and the new earth, i. 264
Buttmann, A., on John xix. 35, ii. 405

BYR

Byron, Lord, his translation of the apocryphal Corinthian epistles, i. 41

CÆSAR, JULIUS, restores Corinth to its former splendour, i. 17
Cæsar's household, Paul's reference to the saints in, i. 105; introduction of the gospel to, 172, 173
Cæsarea, epistles to the Philippians, Colossians and Ephesians supposed to be written from, i. 166; ii. 223, 190, 191
Caiaphas, high-priest, associated with Annas, ii. 397; origin of the mistake, 397
Caius, sends salutations to the Roman Christians from Corinth, i. 116; inference drawn from, that Paul wrote to the Romans from Corinth, 116. *See* Gaius
Caius of Rome, rejects the Pauline authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 182; ascribes the Revelation to Cerinthus, from opposition to Montanism, 243
Caligula, his persecution of the Jews, i. 226
Cana, the miracle at, ii 280
Canonical and apocryphal works, distinction between known to writer of 2 Peter, ii. 456
Canonicity of the Revelation, i. 295
Capernaum, residence of Peter and Matthew, i. 365, 501
Cappellus, on the date of the Galatian epistle, i. 74
Carlstadt, doubts the authenticity of the Revelation, i. 275
Carthage, synod of, A.D. 397, put the epistle of James into the canon, i. 326; another held under Cyprian, A.D. 256, quoted 2 John as the apostle's, ii. 255; third council at, adopts 2 Peter, 452
Cassander, Macedonian general, names Thessalonica after his wife, i. 4
Cassiodorus, knew no Latin commentary on the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 188; calls the seven catholic epistles *canonical*, 303; on Clement of Alexandria's explanation of the catholic epistles, 324; on the title of 1 John ii. 244

CHR

Cassius, at the battle of Philippi, i. 157
Catholic, meaning of, applied to epistles, i. 302, 303
Catholic church, the idea of, taught in the epistle to the Ephesians, ii. 221, 222
Catholic epistles, how added and incorporated with the canon of the New Testament, i. 302–303
Catholics, Roman, suppose Peter to be the first bishop of Rome. i. 103–106; legend about his going to Rome examined, 502–506
Cayster, river, Ephesus situated on, ii. 195
Celibacy, question of, in the Corinthian church, i. 32
Celsus, receives the Galatian epistle, i. 86; acquaintance with the first two chapters of Matthew, 393; with Luke, 448; on the integrity of Mark, 575; supposed to have known John's gospel, ii. 361
Census of Quirinius, fixes the date of the nativity, i. 493
Cephas or Peter, the changed name of Simon, i. 501
Cephas-party in the Corinthian church, i. 23–28
Cerinthus, his acquaintance with Matthew's gospel, i. 393; the Revelation attributed to, by the Alogi, 245; John's gospel attributed to, ii. 386; not properly a Gnostic, 181; story of his meeting John in a bath, 187; cannot be brought into the time of John, 181; belonged to the time of Trajan, 181; the Gnostics referred to in the Colossian letter, not Cerinthian, 181
Charisms or spiritual gifts, in the Corinthian church, i. 36
Charteris, Prof., on the allusions to John's gospel in Hermas, ii. 327
Chloe's household, members of, inform Paul of the state of the Corinthian church, i. 19
Choronensis, Moses, his history, edited by Whiston's sons, i. 40
Chrestus or Christus, supposed by the Roman pagans to instigate the Jews to rebellion, i. 102
Christ, death of, the centre of Paul's gnosis, ii. 178; the *pleroma* de-

CHR

scended upon him and dwells in him bodily, according to the Colossian writer, 183; the pleroma is the spiritual body of Christ, according to the Ephesian writer, 221; time of his ministry, 387; his person differently described in the Revelation and John's gospel, i. 263; the Pauline idea of Christ's person, 100, 101; second coming of, Paul preaches the, at Thessalonica, i. 5; alleged errors of the Thessalonians regarding the, 339; forms the burden of second Thessalonians, 339; animating motive of the apostolic epistles, 247, 248; central idea of the Revelation, 281; Paul's view, 283; referred to in the second epistle of Peter, ii. 457. *See* Revelation

Christ-party in the church at Corinth, i. 23-28; different opinions respecting, 22-25

Christians, public relations of, how treated by Paul, i. 45

Christianity, introduced to the Galatians, i. 71, 72; its superiority to Judaism shown by the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, 233, 234; introduced into Crete, ii. 9

Christology of the Philippian epistle, i. 159-162; of the epistle to the Hebrews, 203, 204; of the Revelation, 257-263; of the epistle to the Colossians, ii. 183; of the epistle to the Ephesians, 221; the christology of the Colossian and Ephesian epistles different from Paul's, 208, 221

Chronology of the Acts, ii. 166, 167

Chrysostom, Dion, his description of Corinth, i. 17; speaks of the returning Nero, 288

Chrysostom, John, on Paul's visits to the Corinthian Christians, i. 38; accepts the epistle to the Hebrews as Pauline, 193; identifies James the Less and James the Lord's brother, 304; identifies Luke the physician with the evangelist, 424; John, vii. 53—viii. 11 passed over by, ii. 428; on the second epistle of Peter, 452

Church at Thessalonica, its formation, i. 4; epistles to, *see* first and second Thessalonians; at Corinth,

CLE

17, 18, *see* first and second Corinthians; at Philippi, *see* Philippians; at Rome, *see* Romans; at Ephesus, *see* Ephesians; church at Colossæ, *see* Colossians, epistle to the

Church, ancient Greek, received the epistle to the Hebrews as Pauline, after Eusebius, i. 193

Church, its future flourishing state supposed to be described in the last two chapters of the Revelation, i. 294, 295

Church of Rome, erroneously supposed to be alluded to in the Revelation, i. 301

Church, Western, did not receive the epistle to the Hebrews as apostolic till the fourth century, i. 194

Churches in Galatia, founded by Paul, i. 71, 72; his epistle addressed to, written with his own hand, 91; adversaries of Paul in the, 80, 81; their state when visited by Paul a second time, 82; their composition, 83. *See* Galatians, epistle to the

Cicero, his description of Corinth as the light of Greece, i. 17

Cilicia, joined to Syria, and Quirinius their proconsul, i. 495

Circular, applied to epistles, meant by the word *catholic*, i. 302. *See* Encyclical

Claromontanus, codex, separated the epistle to the Hebrews from the Pauline, i. 183

Claudius, emperor, banishes the Jews from Rome, i. 18, 101; Hitzig identifies him with 'the withholder' in the second Thessalonian epistle, 342

Clement, member of Cæsar's household, not Clement of Rome, i. 162, 163; a Philippian Christian, 163, 175

Clement of Alexandria quotes the first epistle to the Thessalonians, i. 10; the first epistle to the Corinthians, 42; the second to the Corinthians, 63; the epistle to the Galatians, 86; alludes to Peter in his relation to Simon Magus, 104; quotes the epistle to the Romans, 118; that to the Philippians, 158; asserts the Pauline authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews, 188;

CLE

his opinion of the cause why Paul withheld his name from the epistle to the Hebrews, 195, 196; his use of the word *catholic*, 302; commented on all the catholic epistles, 324: ascribed the Revelation to John, 244; quotes the first epistle of Peter, 506, 507; his opinion of the authorship of Luke's gospel, 448; on the authorship of Mark's gospel, 535; on its date, 569; assigns it to Rome, 570; supposes Mark the latest of the synoptists, 552; on the authorship of the Pastoral epistles, ii. 38; on the first epistle of John, 231; on the second and third epistles of John, 254; on John's gospel, 369; wrote a book on the Passover, 373; attests the existence of the first two chapters in Matthew's gospel, i. 393; does not allude to Peter's second epistle, ii. 447; refers to Jude's epistle, 265

Clement of Rome, supposed allusions in his epistle to the first epistle addressed to the Thessalonians, i. 8, 9; supposed reference to the Galatian epistle, 85; quotation from the epistle to the Romans, 116; supposed to be the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, 177; the writer of the Clementine letter borrowed from that to the Hebrews, 177; his acquaintance with James's epistle, 323; doubtful allusion to Luke's gospel, 443; no trace of acquaintance with Mark, xvi. 9–20; his testimony for Paul's second imprisonment at Rome and release, ii. 21–23; alludes to the second epistle of Peter, 443; doubtful references to the acts of the Apostles, 146, 147

Clementine Homilies, their acquaintance with Luke's gospel, i. 447; doubtful reference to the Acts, ii. 148; quote John's gospel, 358

Clementine Recognitions, show acquaintance with Luke's gospel, i. 447

Coelln, Von, quoted by Tholuck for Philo's exegesis to show its dissimilarity to that of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 219

COR

Colassæ, another orthography of Colossæ, ii. 170

Colossæ, its history, ii. 170; mentioned by Herodotus and Xenophon, 170; loses its greatness under the Seleucidæ and the Romans, 170; Strabo puts it among several *little towns*, 170; church formed in, 170; Philemon supposed to be bishop of, i. 149; suffered from an earthquake, ii. 191

Colossians, epistle to the, ii. 170; who planted the church, 171–175; its authenticity, 176–178; its theology and polemic bearing, 178–188; un-Pauline in sentiments and words, 186–188; its date and place of writing, 190, 191; its contents, 191–193; Tychicus bearer of it, 193; the epistle from Laodicea, 193; the apocryphal Loadicean epistle, 194; the lost Loadicean epistle not identical with the extant one to the Ephesians, 194

Colani, on the Messianic belief in Jesus's visible return as expressed in Matthew, xxiv. xxxv., i. 403

Coming of Christ, the second, erroneous views entertained by the Thessalonians respecting, i. 339; the animating motive of the Apostolic epistles, 247; the central idea of the Revelation, 281; Paul's view, 283; referred to in the second epistle of Peter, ii. 456

Constantinople, Luke's bones said to have been transported to, i. 425

Corinth, its situation, i. 17; the capital of Achaia, 17; noted for its wealth and luxury, and for the Isthmian games, 17; styled by Cicero *the Light of Greece*, 17; destroyed by Mummius, 17; restored by Julius Cæsar, 17; Venus worshipped at, 17; celebrated for its schools of philosophy, 17; remarks of Aristides and Dion Chrysostom upon, 17; Paul resides at, 17, 18; opposition of the Jews to his labours, 18; he forms a church at, chiefly of Gentiles, 18; the residence of Aquila and Priscilla, 18; arrival at, of Timo-

COR

thy and Silas, 18; disturbances arising from Paul's preaching, 18; humane conduct of Gallio in quelling the insurrection, 18; Paul's departure from, 18; writes from Ephesus his first epistle to the church at, 19; epistle to the Romans written at, 115, 116

Corinth and Thessalonica, circumstances of the churches at, not very dissimilar, i. 13, 14; this explains some similarities of thought and language between the first epistle to the Thessalonians and those addressed to the Corinthians, 13, 14

Corinthians, Clement's epistle to, its allusions to the second epistle of Peter, ii. 443

Corinthians, first epistle to the, origin of the church, i. 17; its occasion, 18; irregularities of the church, 18; time and place of writing this epistle, 19, 20; written from Ephesus, 20; its date spring of A.D. 57, 20; state of the church, and questions which agitated it when Paul wrote, 20–22; its party divisions, 22–29; opinions respecting them, *ib.*; disorders of the church in addition to the strife of parties, 29: case of incestuous intercourse, 29, 30; improper observance of the Lord's supper, 30, 31; appeal to heathen tribunals, 31; doubt or denial of the resurrection, 31, 32; subject of celibacy, 32; the duties of Christians respecting flesh offered to idols, 33–35; the demeanour of females, 35; spiritual gifts, 35, 36; Paul's visits to, before he wrote to the Corinthians, 36; opinions of critics respecting them, 37, 38; first extant epistle not the first received from the apostle, 39; authenticity of the present epistle attested by external evidence, 41, 42; its contents, 42–47; difference of the Corinthian epistles from those to the Romans and Galatians, 48

Corinthians, second epistle to the, i. 49; account of the apostle between the writing of the two extant epistles, 49–52; effects of the first epistle to the, and state of the

CUR

church when the second was written, 52–55; its occasion and object, 55; time and place of writing the epistle, 56; opinions of commentators on, 57, 58; unity and integrity of the epistle, 58–61; unity impugned by Semler and others, 59; awkward break at vi. 14; diction and style, 61, 62; opinions of various critics, *ib.*; authenticity denied by B. Bauer, 62; attested by the fathers, 63; its contents, 63–68

Corinthians, the epistles to, compared with those to the Romans and Galatians, i. 48

Cornelius, baptism of, circumstances attending awake suspicion, ii. 126, 127

Correspondences, verbal, of the first three gospels, i. 360, 361

Credibility of the Acts determined by its contents, ii. 85; tested by four things, 85

Credner, attributes the Revelation to John the presbyter, i. 276; holds the priority of the Ephesian to the Colossian letter, ii. 223; on the original language of Matthew's gospel, i. 382; on the source of the information given in the Acts, ii. 138; on the Muratorian canon respecting Jude, 266; on Justin's quotations from the fourth gospel, 340; his opinion of the meaning of the passage in the Muratorian fragment which refers to the epistles of John and Jude, 266

Crenides, ancient name of Philippi, i. 156

Crete, gospel introduced into by Titus along with Paul, ii. 9; nothing in the Acts about Paul's preaching in Crete, 9

Crispus, converted by Paul at Corinth, i. 18

Crucifixion, narrative of in Luke's gospel, i. 463; the day on which it took place, different in the synoptists and the fourth gospel, ii. 370

Crusaders, tombs of John and Mary pointed out in time of, ii. 196

Cureton, publishes Melito's apology in Syriac, ii. 446

Curetonian Syriac version, its date, ii. 388

Cybele, worship of, in Galatia, i. 71
Cyprian, quotes 2 Corinthians, i. 63; does not mention the epistle to the Hebrews, 83; attributes the Revelation to John, 244; quotes 1 John ii. 232; also the second epistle of Peter, 449
Cyprus, birthplace of Barnabas, i. 178; connected with Alexandria, 178; visited by Mark and Barnabas, 533
Cyrenius, governor of Syria when a census was taken of Judea, i. 493. *See* Quirinius
Cyril of Alexandria, ascribes the epistle to the Hebrews to the apostle Paul, i. 191
Cyril of Jerusalem, accepts the epistle to the Hebrews as Pauline, i. 193; on 1 John ii. 232; on the second epistle of Peter, ii. 452

DALMATIA visited by Titus, ii. 8
Daniel, the fourth Empire in, referred to the Roman one, i. 342; Antiochus in typified antichrist, 342; furnishes symbols and figures for the Revelation, 285
Dannemann, on the Revelation, i. 261
Davidic descent of Christ, the genealogical tables in Matthew and Luke, meant to trace, 451, 452
Day of the Lord, allusion to in Peter's second epistle, ii. 457
Deaconesses, their character and qualifications, ii. 18, 52
Deacons, their character and qualifications, ii. 18, 52; the seven who were first elected, 76, 122
Dead, resurrection of the, Paul's teaching respecting, i. 8, 46; denied by some of the Corinthians, 45; asserted to be past by Hymeneus and Philetus, ii. 5
Death, man's, discrepant causes of in 1 Cor. xv. and Romans v., i. 47
Death of Christ, the central point of Paul's gnosis, ii. 178; account of in John's gospel, ii. 289, 290; the day on which it took place different in the synoptics and fourth gospel, 370
Deaths of Peter and Paul at Rome, testimony of the fathers respecting, i. 502–505; insufficient in the case of Peter, 503–506
Delitzsch, his supposed epilogue to the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 180; his opinion as to the cause of the position which the epistle to the Hebrews has in the Peshito, 193; supposes that Paul's letters have a relationship to Philo's Alexandrianism, 217
Demetrius the silversmith, raises a disturbance at Ephesus, i. 52
Demonology of the Revelation, i. 267, 268
Dependence of the fourth gospel on the first three, not far-reaching, ii. 394
Derbe, a city of Lycaonia, i. 70; Timothy a native of, ii. 1
Development in the mind of Jesus, different opinions as to, ii. 302, 303; the gospel of John assumes none, 302; development in the case of Paul, i. 340
Dialogue with Trypho, Justin's, its date, ii. 335; notice of the Colossian epistle in, 177; Logos doctrine in, 344, 345
Didymus, considers the second epistle of Peter a forgery, ii. 451
Dietlein, finds allusions to 2 Peter in Hermas, ii. 440, 444
Diodati, urges the prevalence of the Greek language in Palestine at the time of Christ, i. 380
Diodorus Siculus, states that Philippi was formerly called Crenides, i. 156
Diognetus, epistle to, alludes to the epistle to the Galatians, i. 85; allusion to the first epistle of Peter, 507, 508; allusions to the Acts, ii. 148; to John's gospel, 362
Dion Cassius, respecting the Jewish population at Rome, i. 101
Dionysius of Alexandria, ascribes the epistle to the Hebrews to Paul, i. 191; on the authorship of Revelation, 244, 245; holds the authenticity of John's first epistle, ii. 232; on the second and third epistles of John, 254
Dionysius of Corinth, his statement respecting Peter and Paul founding the Roman church, i. 104
Docetæ, extracts from their books

given by Hippolytus, one referring to John iii. 5, 6, ii. 356
Doddridge's Life of Colonel Gardiner, vision of Christ on the cross related in, ii. 125, 126; compares epistle to Philemon to an epistle of Pliny's, i. 155
Doepke, quoted by Tholuck for Palestinian exegesis, i. 219
Döllinger, Dr. von, his view of the Alogi, ii. 386, 387
Donaldson, Dr. James, observations on the Apollinarian fragments, ii. 384; on Barnabas's supposed acquaintance with the fourth gospel, 326, 327
Donker-Curtius, on the Revelation, i. 261
Doxology, concluding one in the epistle to the Romans, its authenticity examined and rejected, i. 118–121
Dragon, the, in the Revelation, that gave power to the beast, represents Satan, i. 290
Drama, prophetic, the Revelation supposed to be a, i. 280
Duke of Somerset, on the conduct of Paul in undertaking a Nazarite vow, ii. 133
Dualism, contained in the fourth gospel, ii. 303–305
Düsterdieck, his opinion of the innumerable multitude in ch. vii. of the Revelation, i. 254; his erroneous date of the first epistle of John, ii. 242

EARTHQUAKE, allusions to the, which affected cities in Asia Minor, ii. 191
Eastern church, admits the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 194
Ebed-Jesu, reckons the epistle to the Hebrews the fourteenth of Paul's, i. 194
Ebionite Gnosticism, the precursor of Montanism, ii. 189; confronted by the author of the Colossian epistle with a conciliatory Pauline tendency, 186
Ebrard, makes Hebrews xiii. 22–55, an epilogue to the letter, i. 180; emphasises the idea that John's visions were *given* in the Revelation, in its bearing on the identity of authorship in that work and the fourth gospel, 273; on the language of Peter's discourses in the Acts, ii. 114, 115
Ecclesiastical widows or female presbyters, ii. 52; instituted in the second century, 52
Echedorus, river, Thessalonica built at the mouth of, i. 4
Eichhorn, on the language of the second epistle to the Corinthians, i. 61; considers the Apocalypse a dramatic poem, 280; rejects the authenticity of the pastoral epistles, ii. 13; on the style of John's first epistle, 251.
Elders of churches, Peter's directions to, i. 532; their character and qualifications, ii. 18; identical with bishops in the apostolic time, 53; a distinction between them made in the pastoral epistles, 53
'Elect lady and her children,' meaning of the words so translated, ii. 260; the second epistle of John addressed to, 259; different opinions about, 259, 260; not a woman but a church, 260;
Elohim, rendered *angels* in the Septuagint and epistle to the Hebrews, incorrectly, i. 231
Elymas, Paul's encounter with, a parallel to Peter's with Simon Magus, ii. 128
Emmerling, on the language of the second epistle to the Corinthians, i. 61
Encyclical, the epistle to the Ephesians, supposed to have had that character at first, 202, 203
Enoch, book of, furnished ideas for the Revelation, i. 285; quoted by Jude ii. 268; quotation of it denied by some, 268, 269
Engelhard, his hypothesis about Justin Martyr, ii. 340, 341
Epistles, pastoral. *See* pastoral epistles
Epistles, catholic, i. 302, 303
Epistle of John the virgin, supposed to be the earliest subscription of 1 and 2 John, ii. 245
Epiphanius, held the Pauline authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 193; states that the first two

chapters of Matthew's gospel were wanting in the Ebionite copy of the gospel according to the Hebrews, 393; supposes that Luke was one of the seventy-two disciples, 425

Ephesians, epistle to the, notices of Ephesus and its connection with the Christian religion, ii. 195, 196; persons to whom the Ephesian letter was addressed, 196–205; quotations from the fathers upon its authorship, 205–207; internal evidence against its Pauline origin, 208–227; its chief variation from that to the Colossians, 221, 222; the author not identical with him who wrote the first epistle of Peter, 226; time, place, and occasion of writing, 223–227; its contents, 227–229; difficulties inherent in, 229, 230

Ephesus, Paul's second visit to, i. 19; his first epistle to the Corinthians written from, 19; the uproar at, 52; departure from to Troas, 52; Onesimus alleged bishop of the church at, not identical with Philemon's slave, 150; probably the place where the Revelation was written, 278; date of the Ephesian church's formation, 280; one of the celebrated cities of Ionia, ii. 195; metropolis of proconsular Asia, 195; famous for its worship of Artemis, 195; her temple burnt by Herostratus, 195; visited by Paul on his second and third missionary journeys, 195; his preaching there in the school of Tyrannus, 195; success attending his labours, 196; Paul having formed a church there, is supposed to have left it to the care of Timothy, 196; Tychicus said to have brought a letter to Ephesus from Paul in captivity, 196; the tradition of John's residence and death there, 196; his tomb, with that of the Lord's mother, shown in the time of the Crusades, 196; the seat of a bishop, 196; two synods held at, 196; Timothy supposed to be the first bishop of, ii. 2; Timothy said to have been martyred there, 2

Epaphroditus, labours at Philippi, i. 157; bearer of the Philippian letter, 165; his illness, 168

Ephrem, states that the epistle of James was written by the Lord's brother, i. 326; supposed to have written on Tatian's Harmony and the Diatessaron of Ammonius, ii. 359; his opinion of the authorship of John's second and third epistles, 255

Episcopacy, time and manner in which it originated, ii. 53–55; not so early as the time of the apostle John, 54; developed out of presbytery, 53

Epopee, the Revelation so called, i. 280

Erasmus, on the apostolic authorship of the Revelation, i. 274

Erastus, commissioned by Paul to collect contributions for the poor saints at Jerusalem, i. 19

Errorists, described in the epistles of Jude and Peter's second, ii. 441;

Errors of commentators and interpreters of the Revelation, i. 297–301

Eschatology of Paul, i. 8, 247, 248; that of the Revelation, 243; of Matthew's gospel, 248, 401, 402

Esdras, fourth book of, furnished ideas to the writer of the Revelation, i. 266, 285

Essene influence upon the early education of Jesus, visible in Luke, i. 470, 471; Essene Ebionitism apparently opposed in parts of the pastoral epistles, ii. 64, 65; Essene sentiments in the epistle of James, i. 310; Essenism in the Roman Church, i. 137

Euodia and Syntyche, supposed by Baur to mean parties not persons, i. 163; Paul entreats them to be reconciled, 175

Eusebius alludes to the earthquake at Laodicea, ii. 191; on the authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 192, 193; his use of the word *catholic* applied to epistles, 303: on the Revelation, 245; extract from, relating to Papias of Hierapolis, 366, 367; identifies Luke the physician with Luke the evangelist, 424; on Luke's gospel,

EVA

434; on Mark's gospel, 536, 569; on the last eleven verses of Mark, 571, 572; on Paul's release from his Roman captivity, ii. 24, 26; on the first epistle of John, 232; on the second and third epistles of John, 256; on Jude, 267; his statement respecting Papias and its bearing on John's gospel, 331, 332; on the second of Peter, 450;

Evanson, questions the authenticity of the epistle to the Romans, i. 116

Ewald, supposes the Christ party at Corinth Christian Essenes, i. 25; that Romans xvi. 3–20 belonged to an epistle addressed to the Ephesian Christians, 124; on the authorship of the Revelation, i. 275, 276; on the composition of the Roman Church, 107; rejects the authenticity of the pastoral epistles, ii. 72; supposes that John dictated his gospel to an amanuensis, ii. 405, 348

Expositors of the Revelation, errors into which they have fallen, i. 297; summary of their mistakes, 297–301

Ezekiel, furnished symbols for the Revelation, i. 285

FABRICIUS, inserts the apocryphal Corinthian epistles in his Codex Apocryphus, N. T., i. 40

Faith and law, Pauline contrast of, foreign to the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 205

Faith, the righteousness of, different from the righteousness according to faith in the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 205

Faith, meaning of, in the pastoral epistles and injunctions respecting, ii. 55, 56

Faith, justification by, doctrine of, as stated in the epistle to the Galatians, i. 88; in the epistle to the Romans, 130; James's doctrine of justification by faith and works together, 318–321

False teachers, description of, in the first epistle to Timothy, ii. 28, 29; who they were, 64–66

Farrar, Canon, his assertion about

GAL

the teaching of John and Paul incorrect, i. 255

Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost, passage in 1 John relating to, spurious, ii. 247; Porson's letters to Travis on, 247; vain efforts of Burgess and others in support of its authenticity, 247, 248

Fathers, quotations from the. *See* epistles, gospels, and names of the Fathers

Feeding of the five thousand as related in John's gospel, ii. 282, 283

Feilmoser, his opinion about Peter's visit to Rome, i. 106

Females, their demeanour in public meetings, i. 35

Fifteenth chapter of the epistle to the Romans, shown to be spurious, i. 125–127

Fifth trumpet, Pastorini's interpretation of, i. 301

Firmilian on the second epistle of Peter, ii. 449

Flesh offered to idols, directions of Paul as to, i. 33, 34

Forster, on linguistic parallels in the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 215; on 1 John v. 7, 8; ii. 248

Fortunatus, bearer of a letter from Corinth to Paul, i. 19

Fourth vial, wars of the French revolution viewed as interpreting, i. 299

Fritzsche, holds the inconsistency of 1 Corinthians xv. and Romans v. i. 47; his view of Galatians iv. 13, 73; on the doxology in Romans xvi. 25–27, 121

GAIUS, seized by the silversmiths, in the uproar at Ephesus, i. 52

Gaius, third epistle of John addressed to, ii. 260; identified with Caius, bishop of Pergamus, 260

Galatia or Gallogræcia, a province of Asia Minor, i. 69; peopled by Gauls or Celts, 69; cause of their immigration, 69; conquered by the Romans under Vulso, 70; Galatia in the New Testament, larger or smaller in extent according to different critics, 70, 71; its cities, 70, 71; its religion, 71;

worship of Cybele, 71; its trade, 71; Jewish inhabitants, 71; visited by Paul on his second missionary journey, 71; on his third missionary tour, 72; Koppe and others suppose a prior visit, 72. *See* Galatians, epistle to the

Galatians, epistle to the, time and place of writing, i. 72; opinions as to its date, 72, 73; founding of the churches in Galatia, 73, 74; its date, 74; parallelisms with the Corinthian epistles, 74, 75; with the epistle to the Romans, 75–77; place of writing Corinth, 79; Titus its bearer, 79; the apostle's adversaries in the Galatian churches, 80, 81; state of the churches when visited by Paul a second time, 82, 83; composition of the churches, 83, 84; authenticity of the epistle, 85; testimonies of the fathers respecting, 85, 86; its contents, 86–92; relation of it to the Acts, 92–94; resemblances to the epistle to the Romans and differences, 95, 96; interpretation of some important and difficult passages, 96–100. *See* Galatia

Galilee, sea of, Capernaum situated on, i. 501

Gallio, proconsul, Paul accused before, i. 18; refuses to interfere in ecclesiastical matters, 18

Gallo-Græcia. *See* Galatia

Gamaliel, speech of, incorrect, ii. 121, 122

Games, Isthmian, celebrated at Corinth, i. 17

Gauls, or Celts, their immigration into Galatia, i. 69; their leaders, 69; invited by Nicomedes, who rewards them with a part of Bithynia, 69; Attalus checks their encroachments, 69; called Gallogræci or Grecian Gauls, 69; their language, 70; Jerome's statement respecting, 70; subjugated by Vulso, 70; Amyntas their last prince, 70; their country converted by Augustus into a Roman province, 70; description of Galatia in the New Testament, 70; their cities, 70, 71; their religion, 71; their worship of Cybele, 71; their commerce, 71; Jews reside among them and make proselytes, 71; visited by Paul, who forms churches to which he addresses his epistle, 71, 72

Gebhardt, de, his edition of the apostolic fathers referred to, ii, 326

Gentiles, poorer class chiefly form the church at Corinth, i. 18; Paul's mission to them from the beginning, ii. 87; the Acts give a different account of his preaching, 87, 88

Gfrörer, shows that the idea of a millennium was held by Jews, i. 292; that Alexandrian Gnosis influenced Palestinian theology, ii. 208

Gifts, spiritual, in the Corinthian church, Paul's remarks on, i. 36, 37

Gieseler, his explanation of the correspondences of the synoptic gospels, i. 352, 353

Glorification of Christ, how and when accomplished, ii. 289

Gnomology, a collection of discourses used by Luke in ix. 51–xviii. 14, i. 473, 474

Gnosticism. *See* Gnostics; John, gospel of; Valentinus

Gnostics, did not appear in the first century, ii. 178–180; heretical gnosis had its roots in Paul's epistles, 178; began in the reign of Trajan, 179; nature of the gnosticism prevalent among the Colossians, 181–184; erroneous opinions of those who put gnosticism into the time of Paul, 178–180; Baur's hypothesis about gnosticism in the Philippian church, i. 159, 160; many Gnostics with Marcion reject the pastoral epistles, ii. 40; various Gnostic parties pointed at in the pastoral epistles, 64–66; allusions to, in the first epistle of John, ii. 240, 241; in the epistle of Jude, 269; in the second epistle of Peter, 456, 457

Gospels, introductory remarks on the, i. 352; their mutual relations, 352; their sources, 354, 355; composed from written materials chiefly, 355; oral tradition also used, 355; remarks on harmonies, 355, 356; list of parallels in the

first three, 357, 358; sections and places common to Matthew and Mark, 358, 359; passages in Mark and Luke, 359; parallels in Matthew and Luke, 359; verbal correspondences in the three gospels, 360; verbal coincidences between two gospels, 361; phenomena pointed out by Marsh, 361, 362; other phenomena, 362; their narratives real and ideal, 363, 364. *See* names of writers
Gospels, synoptic, their contents compared with John's gospel, ii. 314, 315. *See* synoptists
Greek Church, admits the Pauline authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 194
Greek, epistle to the Hebrews written in, i. 231; prevalent in Rome, 128, 129; Matthew thought by some to have written his gospel in, 378–383
Gregory Nyssene, admits the epistle to the Hebrews as Pauline, i. 193
Gregory of Nazianzus, admits the Pauline origin of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 193; on the second epistle of Peter, ii. 452
Gregory Thaumaturgus, admits the Pauline origin of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 193
Greswell, his harmony of the Gospels a failure, i. 355, 356
Griesbach, rejects the authenticity of 1 John v. 7, 8, ii. 248; supports the view that Mark's gospel was taken from those of Matthew and Luke, i. 549
Grimm, on the date of James's epistle, i. 323
Groot, de, on the language of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 215
Guericke, on the Christ-party in the Corinthian church, i. 24; on the authorship of Revelation, 272

HAMMOND, his opinion of the new heaven and the new earth, i. 294
Harless, on Origen's opinion respecting the language of Matthew's gospel, i. 372; on a passage in the epistle to the Ephesians, ii. 215

Harmonies of the gospels, remarks on, i. 355, 356
Harnack, says that there is no certain knowledge about Ignatius having been brought to Rome, i. 9
Hartwig, calls the Revelation a symbolical dramatic poem, i. 280
Hase, on the Messianic belief in Jesus's visible return as expressed in Matthew xxiv. xxv., i. 403
Haupt, supposes that the writer of John's first epistle aimed at Cerinthus, ii. 241
Hausrath, finds the lost epistle to the Corinthians in 2 Cor. x.–xiii., i. 51
Hebraisms, in the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 208–210
Hebrews, epistle to the, its authorship, i. 177; Clement of Rome supposed to have written it, 177; ascribed to Barnabas by tradition, 177; reasons for this authorship and their slight weight, 177–179; supposed to have been written by or with the co-operation of Luke, 179; Silas supposed to be its author, 180; Paul its author, 180; opinions of the fathers for and against, 181–195; arguments against the Pauline authorship founded upon internal evidence, 195–216; supposed by Luther to have been written by Apollos, 216; considerations favourable to that view, 216–221; he used Philo's writings, 219–221; time and place of writing, 221–223; persons addressed, 223; arguments against its being addressed to the Jewish Christians in Palestine, 224–226; arguments in favour of Alexandrian readers, 226; its language, 231; occasion and object, 232; its contents, 233; its divisions, 233–238; judgment as to its value, 238, 239
Hebrews, meaning of, in the New Testament, i. 223
Hegesippus, his statement respecting the purity of the church till the time of Trajan, in its bearing on the authenticity of the pastoral epistles, ii. 37
Heinrichs, supposes two letters in the Philippian one, i. 164

HEN

Hengstenberg, uses Polycarp's epistle as a witness for the existence of the Revelation, i. 240, 241; supposes that John was in an ecstatic state when he received the visions in the Revelation, 273; holds the Domitianic date of the Revelation, 278; follows Heydenreich in holding the priority of 2 Peter to Jude's epistle, 442

Hera, the cave of, supposed to be the bottomless pit, i. 299

Heracleon, the Gnostic, author of a commentary on John's gospel, ii. 353

Heretic, Heretics, the Revelation supposed to refer to, i. 300, 301; meaning of the word, ii. 51; not used by Paul, 51. *See* Heresy

Heresy, meaning of the word in the second epistle of Peter, ii. 459. *See* Heretic

Hermas, author of the 'Shepherd,' acquaintance with the epistle of James, i. 323; supposed allusions to the second epistle of Peter, ii. 444

Hermeneutics of the epistle to the Hebrews, different from Paul's, i. 201

Herod Agrippa I., his death fixed by the Acts, ii. 167

Herod the Great, favour of Augustus to, i. 496, 497

Herodotus, speaks of Colossæ as a great city, ii. 170

Herostratus, burns the temple of Artemis at Ephesus, ii. 195

Hervey, Lord Arthur, his attempt to reconcile the genealogies of Jesus in Matthew and Luke, i. 452, 453

Hesychius of Jerusalem, his evidence on the concluding paragraph of Mark's gospel, i. 572

Heydenreich, holds the priority of 2 Peter to Jude's epistle, ii. 442

Hierapolis, affected by the earthquake that destroyed Colossæ, ii. 191

Hierocles, his statement about the towns of Phrygia, ii. 171

High-priest and his office compared with Christ and his office, i. 234-236

Hilary of Poitiers, received the

HOF

epistle to the Hebrews as Paul's, i. 184; followed by others in the West, 184; on the second epistle of Peter, ii. 451

Hilgenfeld, on the Thessalonian epistles, i. 12, 348; his opinion of the difference between the Cephas and Christ parties at Corinth, i. 24; his view of the point about marriage and celibacy agitated in the Corinthian church, 32-33; thinks that the Jewish Christianity of the Revelation is tinctured with Essenism, 295; on the date of James's epistle, 322; on the date of the fourth gospel, ii. 390; supposes that Luke's gospel was written in Achaia or Macedonia, i. 479; rejects the authenticity of 1 Peter, 521; on the character and style of John's first epistle, ii. 251

Hinsch, rejects the Pauline authorship of the epistle to the Philippians, i. 159

Hippolytus, rejects the Pauline authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 181, 182; appears to cite James's epistle, 325; wrote a commentary on the Revelation, 244; favours the authenticity of Mark xvi. 9-20, 572; his account of Basilides as bearing on Luke's gospel, 447, 448; passages in the Philosophumena referring to early heretics and their alleged acquaintance with John's gospel, examined and criticised, ii. 348-356; supposed reference to the second epistle of Peter, ii. 450

Hitzig, F., rejects the authenticity of the Philippian epistle, i. 159; supposes that the Colossian epistle was revised by the author of the Ephesian one, ii. 190

Hitzig, his opinion about the phrase 'what withholdeth,' i. 342; on the authorship of the Revelation, 276; opinion of the writer of the passage about the woman taken in adultery in John's gospel, ii. 431

Hofman, von, adheres to the Pauline authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 216; considers the Christ-party in the Corinthian church orthodox, 25; his view

of the point about celibacy agitated in the Corinthian church, 32; supposes that the persons called *weak* among the Corinthians were Gentile Christians, i. 33; holds the Domitianic date of the Revelation, 278

Holsten, on the Christ-party at Corinth, i. 28; on a second unnoticed visit of Paul to Corinth, 39

Holtzmann, rejects the authenticity of the second epistle to the Thessalonians, i. 348; assumes two interpolations in the epistle to Philemon, 154; supposes that the epistle to the Hebrews was addressed to Jewish believers at Rome, 230; thinks that Luke used Josephus, i. 432; rejects the authenticity of 1 Peter, 521; supposes the Colossian epistle to have been revised by another writer, ii. 100; opinion of, about Luke's use of the Logia document, i. 428; on the dependence of Luke upon Matthew's gospel, 500; on the pastoral epistles, ii. 68, 69; on the we-document of the Acts, 136; on Barnabas's use of the fourth gospel, 327

Honig, on the posteriority of the Ephesian to the Colossian epistle, ii. 209

Hug, his opinion about the denial of the Pauline authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews in the West, i. 183; on James's epistle, 314; on 'the new heavens and the new earth' in Revelation, 294; on the first epistle of John, ii. 246; on the date of the fourth gospel, 420

Husbands and wives, their relative duties, i. 530

Huther, his view of the persons addressed in the epistle of James, i. 314; dates the first epistle of John early, ii. 242

Hymeneus, heresy of, ii. 5

'Hypomnemata' and 'Acts of Pilate,' their relationship, ii. 362–364

IDOLS, flesh offered to, duties of the Corinthian church as to, i. 33, 34

Ignatius, the epistles attributed to, not authentic, i. 9; written after A.D. 150, 9; his martyrdom at Antioch, not at Rome, 9; references in the letters that bear his name to the epistles and gospels: first to the Thessalonians, 9; first to the Corinthians, 41; the epistle to the Galatians, 85; supposed allusions to the epistle to Philemon, 152; to the epistle to the Hebrews, 181; the pastoral epistles, ii. 34, 35; Acts of the Apostles, 147; unacquainted with Luke's gospel, i. 443; on Ephesians, ii. 198, 206; John's gospel, 328; unacquainted with the second epistle of Peter, 445

In Ephesus, difference of opinion as to the authenticity of the words, ii. 196–199; their bearing on the origin of the epistle to the Ephesians, 199; meanings given to the text without them, 197–199; the words an original part of the epistle, 205

Innocent III. stirs up the Crusade, i. 300; his representation of the Saracens, Mohammed and the 666 years, 301

Interpretation of the Revelation, schemes of, *preterist*, *continuous* and *future*, i. 297

Ionia, Ephesus its capital city, ii. 195

Ionian and Ægean seas, Corinth situated between, i. 17

Irenæus, his testimony to the authenticity of the Thessalonian epistles, i. 10, 338; to the Corinthian epistles, 42, 63; to the Galatian epistle, 85, 86; to the Roman epistle, 117; to the Philippian epistle, 158; to the epistle to the Hebrews, 181; his reference to the Revelation, 242; to James's epistle, 323; on the language in which Matthew wrote, 371; on the relation between Luke and Paul, 433; his testimony to Luke's gospel, 448; states that Peter and Paul founded the Roman Church, 502, 504; his testimony to the first epistle of Peter, 506; on the time and place of Mark's gospel, 569; his testimony to the existence of Mark xvi. 9–20, 572; tes-

ISA

timony to the pastoral epistles, ii. 38; on the epistle to the Colossians, 176; his testimony to the Ephesian epistle, 207; on the first epistle of John, 231; on the second epistle of John, 255; on John's gospel, 388–390; does not appeal to Polycarp as a voucher for the Johannine authorship of the gospel, 389; refers to the second epistle of Peter, 445; his testimony respecting Papias's statements manipulated and enlarged by Routh and others, 330

Isaac, bishop of Nineveh, admits the Pauline authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 194

Isidore of Seville, on the authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 184; his account of Matthew's death, 365; his account of the death and burial of Luke, 425

Israel, the spiritual, epistle of James addressed to, i. 313

Isthmian games, their celebration at Corinth, i. 17

JAMES, epistle of, attributed to the Lord's brother by most of the early fathers, i. 309; arguments against his authorship, 309–312; the epistle post-Pauline and written by a Jewish Christian, 312, 313; to whom addressed, 313; place and time of writing, arguments tending to show, 314–323; different opinions about date 322, 323; authenticity and canonicity, 323; quotations from the fathers bearing upon, 323–326; leading object, 326; characteristics of the writer and his readers, 327–330; language and style, 331; its contents, 332–334; Luther's judgment of its value, 334

James, son of Alphæus, notice of, i. 304

James the Lord's brother, notice of, i. 304; his supposed identity with the son of Alphæus, improbable, 305, 306; arguments in favour of his being full brother of Jesus, 306, 307; his position in the church of Jerusalem, 307, 308; early mistakes about him, 308; suppositious productions attributed to him, 309

JOH

James, the son of Zebedee and brother of John, notice of, i. 304

Jebb, bishop, finds the parallelisms of Hebrew poetry in the epistle of James, i. 331, 332

Jerome, on the language of the ancient Gauls, i. 69; did not believe that Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, 184–186; identifies James the Lord's brother with James the less, and supposes the epistle written by him, 304, 326; on the language in which Matthew wrote his gospel, and the gospel according to the Hebrews, 374, 375; identifies Luke the physician with the evangelist, 424; supposes Luke's gospel indebted to Paul, 435; calls Mark the disciple and interpreter of Peter, 536; attests the existence of MSS. terminating Mark's gospel at xvi. 9, 572; adopts the received reading *in Ephesus* (Ephes. i. 1), ii. 197; on Jude, 267; on the second epistle of Peter, 451

Jerusalem, Paul's alleged second visit to (Acts xi. 30) unhistorical, ii. 100; his third visit to, the two accounts in Acts xv. and Galatians ii. compared, 92–100; its destruction supposed to be intimately connected with Christ's second coming, i. 283; Luke's gospel written after its destruction, 477, 478

Jessien, defends the authenticity of Jude's epistle, ii. 271

Jewish or Petrine Christianity represented in the Revelation by John, i. 252, 253; the original apostles continued to be Jewish Christians opposed to Paulinism, 92, 93; union of Jewish Christianity with Paulinism in the second epistle of Peter, ii. 467. *See* Judaism

Jews driven from Rome, i. 18; persecute Paul at Corinth and raise a disturbance, 35; their fate at Alexandria under Caligula, 226

John the Baptist, his testimony to Christ, ii. 279

John the Apostle, his parentage and early life, ii. 275, 276; supposed

to be the author of the fourth gospel, 275; author of the Revelation, i. 240–245; present at the council of Jerusalem, 276; spent the latter part of his life in Asia Minor, 276; banished to Patmos, 276; varying opinions about the emperor who banished him, 276; resides and dies at Ephesus, 276; his tomb pointed out in the time of the Crusades, ii. 196; his Patmos exile pronounced fictitious by Eichhorn, 276; his ministry and death in Asia Minor questioned by many, 276; defended by Hilgenfeld and Krenkel, 276; his character and individuality agree with the contents of the Revelation, i. 247, 248; story of meeting Cerinthus in a bath, 251; retained his Judaic prepossessions, 252; styled *the virgin*, 251, ii. 245

John, first epistle of, styled catholic, i. 302; its authenticity, ii. 231; quotations from the fathers in favour of, 231, 232; differences between it and the fourth gospel, 235–239; time and place of writing, 242; persons addressed, 244; form of the epistle, 245; occasion and object, 246; integrity, 247; its contents, 248–252; a peculiar idea in the epistle, 252, 253

John, gospel of, its alleged author, ii. 275, 276; opinions of the fathers about his latter time, 276; analysis of its contents, 277–295; the Logos conception of the gospel, 277–279; leading characteristics, 295; no development in the incarnate Logos, 299–301; original dualism of 303, 304; few parables and gnomes contained in, 308; its symbolism, 309; its peculiar miracles, 310; has sometimes a twofold aspect, 310-312; the writer acquainted with the synoptics, 312; Arnold's hypothesis about the discourses, 313; difficulty of distinguishing the historical and ideal, 314; it approaches nearest to Luke among the synoptics, 314; comparison of the contents with the synoptical gospels, 314, 315; their similarity and diversity, 316–325; its authorship and date, 326–392; testimonies and opinions of the fathers, 326–389; internal evidence, 392–415; testimonies against its alleged authenticity, 369, &c. &c.; its occasion and object, 420; its integrity, 423–431; style and diction, 431–436; its quotations from the Old Testament, 436, 437; similarity to the first epistle of John, 233–235; their verbal coincidences, 235. *See* Logos.

John Mark, supposed by Hitzig the author of the Revelation, i. 276

John, second and third epistles of, their authorship, ii. 254–257; statements of the fathers respecting, 254–257; internal evidence for their Johannine authorship, 257; the contrary evidence, 258, 259; written by John the elder, 259; to whom addressed, 259, 260; occasion and object, 261; time and place of writing, 262; their contents, 263; parallelisms of the Johannine epistles with the first epistle of Peter, i. 515; the false teachers in them called *antichrists*, 250

John the presbyter, supposed author of the Revelation, i. 276; on the source of Mark's gospel, 534; author of the second and third epistles of John, ii. 259

John the Virgin, epistles of, a conjectural subscription to the first and second epistles of John, ii. 245

Johannine doctrine of the Logos, ii. 277–279, 295–299. *See* John, gospel of; Logos

Josephus, his testimony respecting the Jews at Rome in the time of Augustus, i. 101; his introduction to Poppæa, 173

Jowett, Professor, his statement of the internal evidence for the Pauline authorship of the first epistle to the Thessalonians, i. 15; on the parallels between the epistle to the Galatians and the second to the Corinthians, 75; on the composition of the Roman church, 110

Judaisers, *see* Judaism

Judaism, in the Galatian churches, i. 81; its influence upon the Philippian church, 169, 170, 174;

JUD

its relation to Christianity as viewed by the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, 202, 203; Luke's object to unite it with Paulinism, in his gospel, 467

Jude, notices of his life, ii. 264; styles himself brother of James, 264; not an apostle, 264, 265. *See* epistle of

Jude, epistle of, styled catholic by Origen, i. 302; its authorship, ii. 264; its authenticity, 265; quotations from the fathers respecting, 265–268; quotes the book of Enoch, 268, 269; time and place of writing, 270; persons addressed, 271, 272; occasion and object, 272; contents, 272–274; its relation to the second of Peter, 438–440

Judea, conquered by Pompey the Great, i. 101; converted into a Roman province A. U. C. 759, 497

Junilius, speaks of the seven catholic epistles as canonical, i. 303; his testimony respecting the authenticity of five of them being rejected at Nisibis, ii. 452

Justification, doctrine of, as taught by Paul, i. 88, 130, 131, 205; James's doctrine, 318; opposition between the two, 319, 320

Justin Martyr, on the man of apostasy or antichrist, i. 337; supposed reference to the second epistle to the Thessalonians, 337, 338; alludes to the first epistle to the Corinthians, 42; the address to the Greeks attributed to, 85; his apologies to the Roman emperors written in Greek, not Latin, 129; quotes from the epistle to the Hebrews, 191, 192; attributes the Revelation to the apostle John, 242; acknowledges Luke's gospel without specifying its authorship, 444; no clear trace of his use of Mark's gospel, 570; his acquaintance with the pastoral epistles, ii. 39; his use of the Acts doubtful, 48; dates of his first Apology and the Dialogue with Trypho, 334, 335; discussion respecting his knowledge of John's gospel, 334–348; difference of his Logos doctrine from that of the gospel, 343–347; refers to the second epistle of Peter, 445;

Justus, Paul's fellow-labourer, i. 105

Juvenal, ridicules the Jew-loving Romans, i. 106

KYR

KEIM, on the Messianic belief of Jesus's visible return as expressed in Matthew xxiv. xxv., i. 402; supposes that the author of 1 John aimed at Cerinthus, ii. 241; his view of the time when Jesus's mental development from particularism to universalism took place, 302; his date of the fourth gospel, 390

Kenrick, thinks that Mark wrote the materials of his gospel twice, i. 539; his statement about the objects which Matthew, Mark, and Luke had in writing gospels, i. 568

Kern, objects to the authenticity of 2 Thessalonians, i. 348; on the date of James's epistle, 322

Kingdom of heaven, the meaning of, i. 2, 3

Kirchhofer, quotations from the fathers, vague, i. 152; on the first epistle of John, ii. 231

Klostermann, on the authorship of Acts, ii. 153; on the source of Mark's gospel, 548

Köhler, his date of the epistle to the Galatians, i. 73

Kolthoff, on the Revelation, i. 261

Koppe, on the intimation of Paul's journey to Galatia in Acts xiv. 6, i. 72; on the date of the Galatian epistle, 73

Köstlin, on the date of Clement's epistle to the Corinthians, i. 416; shows against Baur that Matthew xxiv. refers to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, 388; supposes that Luke's gospel was written at Ephesus, 479

Krenkel, separates the innumerable multitude in Revelation vii. from the 144,000, i. 254; refutes Scholten and Keim's view of the apostle John never having been in Asia Minor, 274

Kyria, meaning of, in 2 John i., ii. 259, 260

Kyria. *See* 'Elect lady'

LAC

LACHMANN, his reading of Galatians vi. 12, 13, i. 80; arranges the Catholic epistles immediately after the Acts of the Apostles, 303; receives the second part of 1 John ii. 23 into the text, ii. 248; discards John, vii. 53–viii. 11, 429; his incorrect interpunction of Mark i. 1–3, i. 584

Lactantius, favours the apostolicity of the Revelation, i. 244

Lange, on the identity of James the son of Alphæus and the Lord's brother, i. 305

Langen, supposes that the epistle to the Hebrews was written to the Jewish Christians in Palestine, i. 226

Laodicea, destroyed by an earthquake, ii. 191; council at, acknowledges the Pauline authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 191; decides in favour of Peter's epistles, ii. 452

Laodicea (Laodicean), epistle from, supposed by Wieseler and Thiersch identical with that to Philemon, i. 155; identified by some with the Ephesian letter, ii. 204; Marcion's language quoted in favour of this opinion, 204, 205; identified by Schulthess with the epistle to the Hebrews, 194; now lost, 194; the supposititious Latin one translated into Greek by Hutter, 194; edited by Anger and Lightfoot, 194

Lardner, cites the indistinct allusions of the apostolic fathers to the first Thessalonian epistle, i. 8; his opinion about *the letter* spoken of in 1 Corinthians v. 9, 40; cites allusions to the Galatian epistle in the apostolic fathers, 85; his opinion about Augustine's mode of speaking of the epistle to the Hebrews, 187; his opinion of Eusebius regarding the authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews, 193; supposes Luke to have been a Jew, 424; supposes that Paul planted the church at Colossæ, ii. 171; and that the epistle to the Ephesians preceded that to the Colossians, 223; on the second episttle of Peter 444, 445

LOG

Latin version, the old (vetus Itala), contained the first epistle to the Thessalonians, i. 10; and the second epistle, 339; its date, ii. 388

Law and faith, Pauline contrast of, foreign to the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 205; the doctrine in James's epistle different from, 317, 318

Law, use of the word in Paul's epistles, i. 95, 96

Lazarus, raising of, typical of Christ as the resurrection and the life, ii. 285, 286; unnoticed by the synoptists, 286, 322

Lekebusch, on the Acts, ii. 151

Leo the Great, does not notice the epistle to the Hebrews in his commentaries, i. 188

Leonorius, leader of the Celts in Asia Minor, i. 69

Leontopolis, temple of, supposed to be alluded to in the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 227

Levitical priesthood, compared with Christ's, i. 226–229, 235, 236

Liberty, Christian, the question discussed by the apostles at Jerusalem, ii. 95, 96

Life, the Logos, the principle of, ii. 277; miracles illustrating Christ as the, ii. 310, 311, 234

Light, an attribute of God and Christ, ii. 234–277. *See* Logos

Lightfoot, Bishop, on the order of the Pauline epistles, i. 78; his opinion of the gnosticism combated in the Colossian epistle, ii. 179; labours unsuccessfully to date the Colossian errorists before A.D. 70, 179–181; dates the episcopal office at the commencement of the second century and associates it with the name of John, 54; edits the spurious Loadicean epistle, 194; on the narrative of Polycarp's martyrdom in relation to John's gospel, ii. 329

Lipsius, supposes that Hippolytus describes later forms of Ophitism, ii. 355

Lloyd, Mr., on the transference of liberal ideas respecting the Gentiles from Paul to Peter, ii. 205

Logia-document, originally written

by Matthew, i. 367–370; identical with the gospel according to the Hebrews, 374–376; relationship to the Greek gospel of Matthew, 383; logia not equivalent to *scripture*, 368; not used by Luke, 428; Holtzmann's opinion, 428

Logos, or Word, doctrine of the, in the fourth gospel, ii. 277–279; Philo's idea of, 296, 297; how John's differs from the Alexandrian conception, 296, 297; the influences that shaped the doctrine of the fourth gospel, 297–298; Christ not termed the logos absolutely in the first epistle of John as he is in the gospel, 237; Justin's Logos doctrine differs from that of the fourth gospel, 342–347; the principle of light and life, 277

Lord and God, use of the words different in Peter's two epistles, ii. 460

Lord's supper, abuses of in the Corinthian church, i. 30; not described in the fourth gospel, ii. 301

Love feast or Agape, its abuse in the Corinthian church, i. 30; the word is changed in 2 Peter into one with a different signification, ii. 440

Loyola, Ignatius, appearance of the Virgin to, ii. 125

Lucht, rejects with Baur the authenticity of Romans, xv. xvi., i. 125

Lücke, his statement respecting the nature of the errands on which angels are employed in the Revelation and the fourth gospel, i. 267; rejects the authenticity of the first epistle to Timothy, ii. 73; does not receive the authenticity of John, xxi. 423; argues that the first epistle of John followed the fourth gospel, ii. 243; admits that Celsus may have been unacquainted with the fourth gospel, 361; does not hold the apostolic authorship of the Revelation, i. 275

Lüdemann, his explanation of Galat. iii. 19–25, i. 89; his view of the resurrection body meant by Paul, 46

Lukanus, Luke an abbreviation of the name, i. 424

Luke, gospel of, its reputed author, i. 424; its preface considered, 426–428; its sources, 428; opinions of scholars regarding, 428; coincidences between Matthew and Luke, 429, 430; relation of the gospel to the apostle Paul, 452; opinions of the fathers respecting, 433–436; words common to Luke and the Pauline literature, 437–441; parallels of ideas and words between them, 441–443; its authorship, 443; testimonies of the early fathers respecting, 443–448; its contents, 449; divided into five parts, 449–465; its characteristics, 465–475; relation of the gospel to Marcion's, 475–477; time and place of writing, 477–479; sources, 479; for whom written, 480; the instruction of Theophilus, the immediate intention of the writer, 479, 480; language and style of the gospel, 481–489; expressions peculiar to Luke, 490–493; taxing of Quirinius in its bearing on the date of the nativity, 493–499; integrity of the gospel, 499; quotations from the Old Testament, 499, 500; resemblances between it and the Acts, ii. 145, 146

Luke the evangelist, his name abbreviated from Lukanus, i. 424; his profession, 424; his early history, 424; assumed to be a manumitted slave, 424, 425; native place unknown, 425; conjectures respecting, 425; attaches himself to Paul at Troas, 425, whom he accompanies on his journeys, 425; latter part of his life involved in obscurity, 425; supposed to be one of the seventy-two disciples and to have preached in various countries, 425; his death and burial, 425; his bones said to have been taken to Constantinople, 425; supposed to have written a gospel, which *see*; alleged author of the Acts of the Apostles, ii. 148–150; supposed to have written the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 179, 180

Lünemann, on Ignatius's epistle to the Ephesians, ii. 199

Lutarius, leader of the Celts in Asia Minor, i. 69

LUT

Luthardt supposes that because 1 John is quoted in Polycarp's epistle, the fourth gospel was also known at the time, ii. 329

Luther, ascribes the epistle to the Hebrews to Apollos, i. 216; his opinion of the epistle of James, 334; against apostolic authorship of the Revelation, 274, 275; sounding of the fifth trumpet, applied to, 301

Lycus, Colossæ situated on the, ii. 170

Lyons, epistle of the church at, with the church at Vienne, quotes the epistle to the Romans, i. 117; that to the Philippians, 158; admits the apostolic origin of the Revelation, 243; uses the language of Peter's first epistle, 507; refers to the Acts of the Apostles, ii. 148; and to John's gospel, 361

Lystra, a city of Lycaonia, i. 70; account of the cure of the lame man at, similar to a miracle wrought by Peter, ii. 128

MACEDONIA, a Roman province, i. 4; Paul's visit to, 4; conquered by P. Æmilius, 156; divided by him into four parts, 156; Philippi assigned to the first, with Amphipolis for its capital, 156

Macknight, supposes that Titus was the bearer of the Galatian letter, i. 79

Manen, Van, rejects the authenticity of the second epistle to the Thessalonians, ii. 348

Mangold, his view of Paul's writing to the Romans, i. 114; thinks that the false teachers referred to in the pastoral epistles were Essene Ebionites, ii. 64

Man of sin, *see* Antichrist

Marcion admits the Thessalonian epistles into his canon, i. 10, 339; receives the first epistle to the Corinthians, 42; the epistle to the Galatians stood first in his canon, 72, 73; ignores chapters xv. xvi. of the epistle to the Romans, 127; the epistle to Philemon included in his list, 152; excludes

MAR

that to the Hebrews, 183; relation of his gospel to Luke's, 475-477; original readings preserved in it, 476, 477; his gospel a mutilated copy of Luke's, 499; rejects the pastoral epistles, ii. 40; quoted for his acquaintance with John's gospel, ii. 356; Tertullian's statement examined, 356, 357; never uses it, 357; receives the epistle to the Colossians, 177; calls the epistle to the Ephesians the Laodicean one, 204; Tertullian's testimony respecting Marcion's alteration of the title, 204, 205

Mark or Marcus, the evangelist, called John Mark, i. 533; a son of Mary, 533; cousin of Barnabas, 533; of the tribe of Levi, 533; accompanies Paul and Barnabas on their first missionary journey, 533; disagreeing with Paul, he returns to Jerusalem, 533; accompanies Barnabas to Cyprus, 533; reconciled to Paul, who sends for him, and calls him his fellow-worker, 533; Eusebius's statement that he accompanied Peter to Rome, 533; said to have founded the church of Alexandria, 533; died there, 533; his friendship with Peter, 534; Papias's statement respecting, 534; the interpreter of Peter, 534; his gospel said to come from Peter, 534; statements of the fathers and others respecting his connection with Peter, 535-538; called Peter's son, i. 534. *See* gospel of

Mark, the gospel of, i. 533; the person to whom it is attributed, 533; *see* Mark the evangelist; relation of Mark to the second gospel, 538-542; examination of Papias's testimony, 539-540; external evidence as to its being Mark's production unsatisfactory, 542; internal evidence against, 542; its contents, 542-548; divided into three parts, 542; the gospel later than those of Matthew and Luke, 548; opinions of critics respecting its priority or posteriority to the other synoptics, 548, 549; relation to Matthew and Luke, 549; parallels between these gospels,

verbal and other, 549–551; proofs that the writer used Matthew and Luke, 551–563; its characteristics, 564–569; the gospel catholic, undoctrinal and neutral, 564; Kenrick's assertion about its recorded miracles, 568; time and place of writing, 569–571; its integrity, 571; external testimony for and against the last eleven verses, 571–573; internal evidence for and against, 573–575; the conclusion to which the whole tends, 575–578; persons for whom the evangelist wrote, 578, 579; his object, 579; style and diction, 580, 581; words peculiar to Mark, 581, 582; quotations from the Old Testament, 582–584

Marriage, the question perplexing to the Corinthian church, i. 32, 33; Paul's advice respecting, 32, 33; injunctions respecting the marriage of bishops and young widows, ii. 18, 19

Marsh, Bishop, on the allegory of Agar in the Galatian epistle, i. 97; on the verbal agreement of the first three gospels, 361–362; his argument respecting Justin's supposed quotations from the fourth gospel, ii. 341; on Irenæus's statement respecting the date of Matthew's gospel, i. 414

Martyrs, visions of the souls of, in the Revelation, i. 289

Mary, mother of the Lord, her grave at Ephesus pointed out in the time of the Crusades, ii. 196

Masson, Philipp, his translation of the apocryphal Corinthian letters, i. 40

Matthew, gospel of, alleged writer, i. 365; persons for whom intended, 365, 366; language in which Matthew wrote, 366; opinions of the fathers and others respecting, 366–382; no evidence to connect the present Greek gospel with the apostle Matthew, 383–386; its apostolicity, arguments against, 386–390; sources of, 391, 392; contents, divided into three parts, 392–406; its characteristics, 406–412; leading object, 412; time of writing, 413–416; style and diction, 416–419; words peculiar to it, 419, 420; quotations from the Old Testament, 420–423; the gospel preceded Luke's and Mark's and furnished materials for them, 355; comparison of passages in Matthew and Luke, 429, 430

Matthew, notices of the life of, i. 365; his identity with Levi, 365; son of Alphæus, 365; lives at Capernaum, 365; his employment, 365; said to have preached in Arabia Felix, 365; supposed ascetic life, 365; accounts of his death, 365. *See* gospel of

Matthæi, his attempt to account for Chrysostom's silence about John vii. 53—viii. 11, ii. 428

Mayerhoff, rejects the authenticity of the epistle to the Colossians, ii. 190; on the date of Peter's first epistle, i. 522; supposes that Timothy wrote the Acts, ii. 152; on the date of the second epistle of Peter, 468; calls Peter the Apostle of Hope, i. 517

Mediation, the law or dispensation of, i. 80

Melchizedek, his person spiritualised in the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 201; comparison of him as a priest with Christ, 235

Melito, on the Revelation, i. 241; his opinion on the passover controversy, ii. 373; on the second epistle of Peter, 446; his alleged apology addressed to Marcus Antoninus and its bearing upon the authenticity of Peter's second epistle, 446, 447

Memra of Jehovah, a phrase frequent in the Targums, i. 263, ii. 208

Messiah, called the Word of God in the Revelation, i. 263; Matthew's object to show Jesus as the, 412

Methodius, ascribes the Revelation to John, i. 244; alludes to passages in Peter's second epistle, ii. 450

Meyer, considers the Christ-party at Corinth orthodox, i. 25; supposes that the *weak* among the Corinthians were Gentile Christians, i. 35; tries to show harmony between 1 Cor. xv. 44–47 and Romans

v. 47; on the supposed rhetorical art in the second epistle to the Corinthians, 62; inclines to reject the authenticity of the pastoral epistles, ii. 72; his objection to the late date of the Acts, 164; on the twenty-first chapter of John's gospel, 423; misinterprets Polycrates' language, 380, 381

Michael and the devil, their dispute about the body of Moses, whence derived, ii. 269

Michaelis, I. D., thinks the epistle to the Galatians the earliest of Paul's, i. 73; supposes Philemon's house a spacious one, 149; on the Aramæan original of the epistle to the Hebrews, 231

Middleton, Bishop, on the article in 'the epistle' of 1 Corinth. v. 9, i. 39

Millennarianism, opposed by Dionysius of Alexandria, i. 244; by Origen, 244; held by Nepos and his adherents, 244

Millennium, prediction of, in the Revelation, i. 292, 293; the doctrine held by many Rabbins, 294

Miracles, philosophy of, ii. 294; supposed miracle in Jesus' resurrection, 290–295

Mohammed, thought to be the star fallen from heaven, i. 299; pronounced the false prophet by Innocent III., 300, 301

Mommsen, on the Latin inscription supposed to relate to Quirinius, i. 495, 496

Montanism, Montanists, opposed by Apollonius, Caius, and others, i. 242, 243; statements in John's first epistle approaching to Montanism, ii. 252; originated in the Johannine circle of ideas, 252; Baur supposes that the second and third epistles of John were written to the Montanistic part of the Roman church, 261

Moses, compared with Christ, i. 234; Michael and Satan dispute about his body, ii. 269

Moulds of doctrine in the New Testament three, remarks on, i. 1, 2

Moule, Mr., calls the doxology at the end of the epistle to the Romans rapturous, i. 121

Moyne, Stephen le, divides the Philippian epistle into two, i. 164

Multitude, the, which no man could number, in Revelation vii., different from the 144,000, i. 254

Mummius, Roman general, destroys Corinth, i. 17

Muratori, the fragment published by, admits the authenticity of the Thessalonian epistles, i. 10, 339; contains the epistles to the Galatians, 86; to Philemon, 152; the Colossians, ii. 177; the Ephesians, 206; the pastoral epistles, 39; the first epistle of John, 232; speaks of two epistles of John, 252; recognises John's gospel, 366; does not mention the epistle to the Hebrews, except it be in the words 'the epistle to the Alexandrians forged in the name of Paul,' i. 182; omits the epistle of James, 325; the first epistle of Peter, 508; speaks uncertainly about Jude's epistle, ii. 206; omits the second epistle of Peter, 452

Mutual relations of the first three gospels, i. 352–355

Mynster, his statement about the different spirit in the epistle to the Hebrews and Philo, i. 218

Mysticism, theosophic, according to Schenkel, the distinguishing feature of the Christ-party in the Corinthian church, i. 25

NAPOLEON THE FIRST and his wars, supposed allusion to, at the fourth vial, i. 299

Nativity of Jesus, its date determined by the census of Quirinius, i. 497

Neander, on the Petrine and Christ parties in the Corinthian church, i. 24; on an unnoticed visit of Paul to Corinth, where it should be inserted in the history given in the Acts, 39; on the Judaisers among the Galatians, 80; his interpretation of James and Paul in their doctrine of justifying faith and works, 319; rejects the apostolic authorship of the Revelation, 275; on the date of Peter's first epistle, i. 522; defends the authenticity and accuracy of Paul's speech

at Miletus, ii. 110, 111; gives up the authenticity of the first epistle to Timothy, ii. 73; attaches small value to the epistle of Jude, 274; misapprehends Polycrates' language, 380
Neapolis, harbour to Philippi, i. 156
Nepos, a millennarian, disputes between his adherents and Dionysius, i. 244
Nero, supposed to be Antichrist, i. 288; represented by the head of the beast with its deadly wound healed, 290; persecutes the Christians, 278, 523; humanity in the first five years of his reign, 107; married to Poppæa, 168; suicide of, 288; his death not believed, 288; earthquake that destroyed Laodicea, in his reign, ii. 191; Paul executed by his order, i. 502; evidence respecting Peter's martyrdom under Nero or at Rome, invalid, 502-506
Nestorius, quotes Mark xvi. 20, i. 572
Nicæa, council of, admits the Pauline authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 191; settles the Paschal controversy in favour of the Roman usage, ii. 375
Nicephorus, on the martyrdom of Matthew, i. 365; his stichometry as to the extent of a Greek Matthew, and on Mark, 385
Nicodemus, gospel of, quotes Mark xvi., 15–19
Nicodemus, Christ's interview with, ii. 280, 281
Nicolaitans, not a heretical sect, i. 279
Nicolas, proselyte of Antioch, not the founder of a sect, i. 279
Nicomedes, invites the Celts to Bithynia, i. 69
Nisan, 15th of, the day of Christ's death according to the synoptists, ii. 370; the 14th of, according to the fourth gospel, 370
Noack, rejects the authenticity of the epistles to the Thessalonians, i. 348
Novatian, never alludes to the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 182
Norton, his broad generalisations about the gospels, ii. 392

Numerosity, principle of, in the Revelation, i. 285

O'BRIEN, on James's doctrine of justification, i. 320
Octavia, divorce of, i. 168
Œcolampadius, rejects the Apocalypse as a biblical book, i. 275
Office-bearers in the church, qualifications of, ii. 18, 52–55
Olshausen, on a visit of Paul to Thessalonica, i. 5; on the Christ-party in the Corinthian church, 24; on the Judaisers in the Galatian churches, 80, 81; his assertion about age as bearing on the authorship of the Revelation and fourth gospel, 272; his assertion about the original language of Matthew's gospel, 382; on the tendency of the parable of Dives and Lazarus, 459
Onesimus, Philemon's slave, his history, i. 150; made Bishop of Berœa by tradition, 150; or bishop of Ephesus, 150; ran away from his master, 150; sent back by Paul with a recommendatory letter, 151. *See* Philemon, epistle to
Onesiphorus, his steady attachment to Paul, ii. 4
Onias, temple of, supposed to be alluded to in the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 227, 228
Ophitism, supposed to be pointed at in the pastoral epistles, ii. 65, 66
Origen, alludes to the epistle to Philemon, i. 152; uses the epistle to the Hebrews as Pauline, i. 188, 189, 190; styles the epistle of Peter, first John, Jude and Barnabas, catholic, 302; speaks of James's epistle, 324; on the author of the Revelation, 244; on the first epistle of Peter, 507; on Matthew's gospel and its language, 372; on the source of Mark's gospel, 536; his reference to the first epistle of John, ii. 232; to the second and third of John, 254; on the second epistle of Peter, 448; his opinion that blame is implied in the preface of Luke's gospel respecting preceding evangelists, i. 427
Orosius, does not quote the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 188

Otto, I. C. Th., his reference to coincidences between Justin Martyr's language and the Pauline epistles, i. 338
Otto, C. W., on the apostolic authorship of the first epistle of John, ii. 233
Overbeck, his view of the object which the writer of the Acts had before him, ii. 159, 160; refutes Klostermann on the authorship of the Acts, 153; dates the Acts at Rome, 166; his date of the epistle to Diognetus, 362
Owen, Dr. John, attaches undue value to the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 238
Owen, Dr. H., his explanation of the correspondences of the synoptic gospels, i. 353

PALFREY, on the English rendering, 'which things are an allegory,' in Galatians iv. 24, i. 97
Palladius, on the second epistle of Peter, ii. 451
Panormus, harbour of, temple of Artemis near, ii. 195
Pantænus, attributes the epistle to the Hebrews to Paul, i. 188; his testimony concerning Matthew's gospel, 371
Pantheism, in the first epistle of John, ii. 241
Papias, received the first epistles of John and Peter, i. 303; identified James the son of Alpheus and James the Lord's brother, 304; his testimony to the Revelation, 241; extract from his 'exposition of oracles of the Lord' respecting what Matthew wrote, 366–371; knew the first epistle of Peter, 506; calls Mark the interpreter of Peter, 534, 535; says that Mark did not write in order the things spoken or done by Christ, 538; uses the first epistle of John, ii. 231; supposed acquaintance with John's gospel, 329–334; his language made to imply more than was intended, 332; his statement in a Vatican MS. manipulated in favour of his acquaintance with the fourth gospel, 332, 333; his

millennarianism drawn from the Apocalypse, 331
Paraclete, no reference to one distinct from Christ in the first epistle of John, ii. 236; doctrine of, in John's gospel, 288
Parallels between the epistles Galatians and Romans, i. 75–77; the first epistle of Peter and various Pauline ones, 508–510; between first of Peter and James, 513, 514; parallels of the first three gospels, 357–362; between the epistle of Jude and Peter's second, ii. 438–440
Paræus, supposes the Revelation to be a prophetic drama, i. 280; his view held by Hartwig and Eichhorn, 280. *See* Revelation
Parenthetic clauses, in the epistle to the Romans, i. 139; their excessive multiplication, 139
Paschal Chronicle, on the date of Mark's gospel, ii. 569
Paschal controversy, its nature and bearing on the authorship of John's gospel, ii. 369–385. *See* John, gospel of
Pastoral epistles, their authenticity examined, ii. 21–73; quotations from the fathers in favour of their authenticity, 21 &c.
Pastorini, Signor, applies the woe of the fifth trumpet to Luther, i. 301
Patin, Dr., on the title of the first epistle of John, ii. 245
Patmos, John's banishment to, i. 276–278; ii. 276; place where the Apocalypse is supposed to have been written, i. 276
Paul, the apostle, martyrdom of Stephen contributes to his conversion, ii. 77; his discourses in the Acts compared with Peter's, 104–108; his discourses belong in part to the writer of the Acts, 117. For detailed history of, *see* various epistles, the Acts of the Apostles, Paulinism
Paulicians, rejected the first epistle of Peter, i. 508
Pauline Christ, the, i. 160, 161; the idea of Christ in the Philippian epistle, the same as in Paul's other epistles, 160–162; difference of it from that in the fourth gospel,

PAU

161; difference from that in the epistle to the Colossians, 184, 185; difference from that in the Ephesian epistle, 221

Pauline epistles and the first of Peter, parallels between, i. 508–510; parallels between and Luke's gospel, 432, 443. *See* Parallels

Pauline party in the Corinthian church, i. 23

Paulinism, distinguished from Alexandrianism, i. 203-208; of Peter's first epistle, 508–510, 518; Luke's endeavour to unite it with Judaism by softening both down, 467; predominantly practical in the pastoral epistles, ii. 46; basis of the Petrine epistles, ii. 472; its union with Jewish Christianity, 473. *See* epistles of Paul and Peter

Paulus Æmilius, conqueror of Perseus, i. 156

Paulus, his opinion on the unity of the Philippian epistle, i. 165

Pearson on the date of the Galatian epistle, i. 79

Pelagius, admits the Pauline authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 187

Peratæ, sect of, ii. 355

Persecutions, the first which fell upon the early church, ii. 75

Perseus, King of Macedonia, conquered by Paulus Æmilius, i. 156

Peshito version, contains the epistle to the Galatians, i. 86; favours the Barnabas authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews, 178; admits the epistle to the Hebrews, 193; contains the epistle of James, 326; omits the Revelation, 243; contains the first epistle of Peter, 507; rejects the second and third epistles of John, ii. 255; omits Jude, 267; date of, 388

Peter, first epistle of, notices of its alleged author, i. 501; statements of the fathers respecting, 502–505; its authenticity attested by the fathers, 506–508; parallelisms between it and the Pauline epistles, 508–511; these unfavourable to the authenticity of the epistle, 511–513; its parallels with James, 513, 514; the writer acquainted with the epistle to the Hebrews,

PET

516; character of the epistle mediating and against Peter's authorship, 518–520; opinions of critics respecting authenticity of, 521; time and place of writing, 522. 523; persons addressed in, 524; its object, 525, 526; character, style and diction of the epistle, 526-529; contents, 529; divided into two parts, 529–532

Peter, second epistle of, its relation to Jude's epistle, ii. 438; its phraseology, 438; parallels between the two epistles, 438–440; the opponents described in the epistles, 441; arguments of Heydenreich and Hengstenberg to disprove the dependence of the epistle on Jude's, 442, 443; its authenticity, 443; testimony of the fathers bearing upon, 443–453; summing up of this testimony, 453; internal evidence against stronger than the external, 453; examples of it, 453–464; original readers of the epistle, 465; the errorists of the epistle, 466, 467; object and time, 467; place where written, 468; its integrity, 469; contents, 469–472; doctrinal ideas of Peter's epistles, 472, 473

Peter, the apostle, brother of Andrew and son of Jonas, i. 501; not a disciple of John Baptist, 501; the most prominent of the apostles, 501; sent with John to Samaria, 501; imprisoned and miraculously delivered, 501; preached to the Jews, 501; present at the council in Jerusalem, 501; rebuked by Paul at Antioch, 501; was married and had a house, 501; Mark termed his spiritual son, 502; opinions of the fathers respecting his residence and death at Rome, 502, 503; could not have been there before A.D. 63; the tradition respecting his Roman visit and martyrdom examined, 504–506; was he a Pauline Christian? 511, 512; Mark's attachment to him, 533, 534; supposed to have furnished the materials of Mark's gospel, 534–538; his discourses compared with Paul's, ii. 104–107; his vacillations, 99; his discourses

resemble one another, 114, 115; for detailed history of, *refer* to the gospels, Acts of the Apostles, his supposed epistles and those of Paul

Petrine gospel, Mark wrote a, i. 548; used by the writer of the present so-called gospel of Mark, 548, 549

Petrine or Cephas party in the Corinthian church, i. 22–27; difference of, from the Christ party, 24, 27

Petrus Siculus, says that the Paulicians rejected the first epistle of Peter, i. 508

Pfleiderer, holds the inconsistency of the cause of death given in 1 Cor. xv. and Romans v. i. 47; rejects the authenticity of the second epistle to the Thessalonians, 348; his view of the authenticity of the second epistle to Timothy, ii. 71; his view of the Colossian letter, its date and authorship, 190; supposes it to have been retouched by a later writer, 190

Philastrius of Brescia, admits the second epistle of Peter into his canon, ii. 452

Philemon, Paul's epistle addressed to, i. 149; a member of the church at Colossæ, 149; called by the apostle a fellow-labourer, 149; according to tradition a bishop of Colossæ and martyr at Rome, 149; according to Michaelis had a spacious house, 149; perhaps converted by Paul, 149, 150; Benson's view about his conversion, 149; had a church in his house, 150; Archippus a supposed son, and Apphia his wife, 150; Onesimus his slave, 150. *See* Philemon, epistle to

Philemon, epistle to, the person addressed, i. 149; occasion of the letter, 150; time and place of writing it, 151; its authenticity, 152; quotations from the fathers in proof, 152, 153; Baur's objections, 153; contents, 154, 155; Doddridge's comparison of it to a letter of Pliny, 155; not the epistle mentioned in Colossians iv. 16, 155

Philetus, his heresy, ii. 5

Philip, king of Macedon, fortifies Philippi, i. 156; the city named after him, 156

Philippi, Polycarp's epistle addressed to the church at, i. 337; second epistle to the Corinthians sometimes supposed to be written from, i. 56; city of, belonged originally to Thrace, 156; afterwards assigned to Macedonia, 156; its ancient name Crenides, 156; fortified by Philip and named after him, 156; famous for its battles, 156; visited by Paul on his second missionary journey, 156; Paul imprisoned there, 157; again visited by him on his third journey, 157; the first European town that received the gospel, 157; triumphs of Christianity in, 157; Paul addresses an epistle to, which *see*; supposed by Greswell to be Luke's birthplace, 425

Philippians, epistle to the, its authenticity attested by the fathers, 157, 158; questioned by a few, 158, 159; Baur's arguments combated, 159–164; the christology in chap. ii. 5–8, compared with the acknowledged Pauline christology, 159–162; unity of the epistle, 164; number of Philippian epistles, 165; time and place of writing, 166; state of the church, 169–171; occasion and object, 171; peculiarities in the epistle, 171–173; contents, 173; divided into six parts, 173–176

Philo, his method adopted in the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 216, 217; probability that his writings were used by the author of the epistle, 219, 220; passages and expressions adduced in proof, 219, 220; his Logos-doctrine resembles the christology of the Colossian epistle, ii. 184; his influence upon the fourth gospel, ii. 295, 296; his conception of the Logos, 296, 297

Philosophumena of Hippolytus, passages in bearing upon the testimony of the ancient heretics to the authorship of Luke's gospel and of John's, i. 447, 448; ii. 348–356

Philosophy, schools of, numerous at Corinth, i. 17

Phœbe, deaconess of the church at Cenchrea, i. 116; supposed to have

been the bearer of the epistle to the Romans, 116; recommended to the church at Rome, 138
Photius, speaks of Clement's explications of the catholic epistles, ii. 448
Phrygia Pacatiana, Colossæ a city of, ii. 170; Paul's two journeys through, 171
Phrygians, prone to speculation respecting the invisible world, ii. 189
Pieces, the second Corinthian letter made up of, written at intervals, i. 60
Pilate, Acts of. *See* Acts of Pilate
Pleroma, doctrine of, in the Colossian epistle, ii. 182; in the Ephesian epistle, 221, 222
Plumptre, Prof., on the sermon on the Mount, i. 397
Pneumatology of the Revelation agrees with that of the apostolic writings, i. 250; is not in harmony with that of the fourth gospel, 267
Polycarp, his supposed testimony to the authenticity of the first and second epistles to the Thessalonians, i. 9, 337; on the authenticity of the epistle to the Philippians, 157; cites the first epistle to the Corinthians, 41, 42; alludes to the Galatian epistle, 85; quotes the epistle to the Romans, 117; improperly cited on behalf of the Revelation, 240, 241; has allusions to the first epistle of Peter, 506; knew the gospels of Matthew and Luke, 443, 444; quotes the epistles to Timothy, ii. 37; supposes the existence of the Acts, 66; alludes to the Ephesian epistle, 205; alludes to the first epistle of John, 231; does not notice the fourth gospel, 328; on the time of the passover feast, 372; makes no mention of the second epistle of Peter, 445; the date of his letter, 36, 328, 329; ii. 328, 329
Polycrates, on the passover, ii. 374; on John's wearing a high-priest's mitre with a metal plate, 404
Pompey the Great, his conquest of Judea, i. 101; transports Jews as slaves to Rome, 101

Pope, the, identified with antichrist, i. 301
Popery, its downfall, views of Protestants regarding it in the Revelation, i. 301
Popes, their succession, supposed by Protestants to be represented by the beast, i. 301
Poppæa, married to Nero, Josephus introduced to, i. 173
Porphyry, attests the existence of the first two chapters in Matthew's gospel, i. 393.
Post-Paulinism, exemplified in the epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, ii. 182–188, 208–222
Primasius, disbelieved Paul's liberation from prison at Rome, ii. 26
Priscilla. *See* Aquila, Acts
Prophet, the false, Mohammed represented as, by Innocent III., i. 300, 301
Prophets, in Polycarp's epistle, not equivalent to 'apostles,' i. 240, 241
Propitiation, doctrine of, in John's first epistle, ii. 237
Ptolemy, in his epistle to Flora, supposed to quote John, i. 2, 3, ii. 353; quotes the epistle to the Ephesians, 207

QUARTODECIMANS, their view of the passover, ii. 375; did not acknowledge the fourth gospel as John's, 376; appealed to Matthew's gospel for their view of the paschal supper, 380; no Ebionite or heretical party among them, 378; views of Weitzel, Steitz, and Donaldson respecting, refuted, 378, 381
Quirinius, his census fixes the date of the nativity, i. 493; appointed proconsul of Syria, 4 B.C., 495; subdued the Homonadenses, 495; not twice proconsul, 495, 496
Quotations in the epistle to the Hebrews unlike the Pauline ones, i. 196–198

RECONCILIATION, doctrine of, as set forth in the epistle to the Hebrews, foreign to Paul, i. 204; difference of Paul's doctrine and that in the Colossian epistle, ii. 185

RED

Redemption, doctrine of, more Jewish in the Revelation than in John's gospel, i. 266; Paul's doctrine of, different from that of the Colossian epistle, ii. 185

Regeneration effected by baptism and the Spirit, in the fourth gospel, ii. 336; by baptism, according to Justin Martyr, 336, 337; the word of God is the principle of, in Peter's epistles, 473

Reiche, his view of Paul's design in writing the epistle to the Romans, i. 112

Renan, M., his view of the epistle to the Romans, i. 124; supposes the epistle of Jude to have been written against Paul, A.D. 54, ii. 270

Resurrection, doctrine of, as taught by Paul, i. 46, denied by some Corinthians, 45; his views of the resurrection body in 1 Cor. xv. and 2 Cor. v. 4, discrepant, 46; first and second mentioned in the Revelation, 292; separation of the two by a thousand years, peculiar to the Revelation, 292, 293; the first mentioned in the book of Daniel, 292; the resurrection of Christ as described in the gospels, examined, ii. 291–295; the discrepancies in the gospel accounts pointed out, 291–295

Resurrection and the life, raising of Lazarus, presents Christ as, ii. 285, 310

Reuss on the progress of events influencing the way in which Antichrist is spoken of, i. 341, 342; rejects Paul's second captivity at Rome, ii. 35; holds the Pauline authorship of the second epistle to Timothy, ii. 71; rejects the Pauline authorship of the first to Timothy and that to Titus, 71

Revelation, book of, its author, i. 240; testimony of the fathers, 240–246; internal evidence, 246–255; two passages supposed to be adverse to apostolic authorship, 255–257; resemblances and discrepancies between the Revelation on the one hand, and the fourth gospel with John's first epistle on the other, 257–274; the diversities doctrinal, theological and linguistic,

ROM

266–274; opinions of Erasmus, Luther, and Zwingli, of Œcolampadius, Bucer, and Carlstadt, 274–275; some critics assign the book to John the presbyter, 276; Hitzig's hypothesis, 276; time and place of writing, 276–280; class of writing to which it belongs, 280; its object, 281; general structure, 284, 285; analysis of contents, 285–290; survey of different phenomena in the book, 290–295; canonicity and value, 295, 296; schemes of interpretation, 297; errors into which expositors have fallen, 297–301. *See* antichrist; advent, second; millennium

Revolution, the first French, wars of the, viewed as interpreting the fourth vial, i. 299

Righteousness and faith, their connection as held by Paul, different from that in the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 205

Rinck, holds the authenticity of apocryphal Corinthian epistles, i. 41

Ritschl, holds the dependence of Luke on Matthew for the quotation from Malachi, in vii. 27, i. 499, 500; supposes various interpolations in Polycarp's epistle, ii. 328; refutes Rothe's opinion about the apostolic origin of episcopacy, 54

Robinson, his harmony of the gospels, a failure, i. 355, 356

Roman Catholics believe that Peter was first bishop of Rome, i. 103

Rome, origin of the church at, i. 101, 102; not known when the gospel was first carried to, 102, 103; Pompey the Great sends large numbers of the Jews to, as slaves, 102; Augustus favours the Jewish population of, 102; Sejanus transports many to Sardinia, 102; conduct of other Roman rulers to, 102; Suetonius' language respecting Chrestus, 102; the banishment of Aquila and Priscilla from, 102, 103; assertion of Roman Catholics that Peter founded the church there, 103; statement of the Clementine Homi-

lies respecting, 103, 104; of the catholic church, 104; of Justin Martyr, 104; of Dionysius of Corinth, 104; of Clement of Alexandria, 104; of Eusebius, 104; of the Liberian catalogue of popes, 104, 105; of Jerome, 105; composition of the church, Jewish Christian, 108–111; epistle to the Philippians written at, 166; epistle to Philemon written at, 151; the Acts supposed to be written at, 165; tradition of Peter's death at, 502; Luke's gospel supposed to be written at, 479; also Mark's, 570; Paul a prisoner at, 150, 151; second epistle to Timothy professedly written at, ii. 2

Romans, epistle to the, i. 101; origin of the church, 102; *see* Rome; state of the church when Paul wrote the epistle to, 106; object of the epistle, 112; opinions of critics respecting, 113–115; time and place of writing, 115; sent by Phœbe, 116; its authenticity attested by the fathers, 116–118; its integrity, 118; authenticity of the concluding doxology questioned, 118–121; its varying position, 118; sixteenth chapter spurious, 122–125; Schulz's conjecture about it, 123, 124; arguments against the authenticity of the fifteenth chapter, 125–127; language of the epistle, 128; the original, Greek, 128, 129; contents, 129–140; divided into two parts, —one doctrinal, the other practical, 129; difficult and important paragraphs interpreted, 140–148

Rothe, his view of the apostolic origin of episcopacy, ii. 54

Rückert, considers the Christ-party at Corinth orthodox, i. 25; his view of Paul's perils at Ephesus, 57; of the second epistle to the Corinthians, 62

Rufinus follows Jerome respecting the authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 187; his Latin translation of Origen not always faithful, ii. 448; on the second epistle of Peter, 448

Ruler's son, Christ's cure of, related in the gospels of Matthew, Luke

and John, ii. 281; peculiarity of the miracle in John's gospel, 281, 282

SABATIER, on the curious title of 1 John, ii. 245

Salvation by faith, doctrine of, explained by Paul, i. 130, 131

Samaria, spread of Christianity in, ii. 123; mythical elements in its narration, 123

Samaritan woman, Christ's conversation with, the narrative symbolical, ii. 281

Sander, on 1 John v. 7, 8, ii. 249

Sangermanensis codex, the epistle to the Hebrews separated in it from the Pauline epistles, i. 183

Saracens, identified with Antichrist by Innocent III., i. 300, 301

Sardinia, Jews transported to, i. 101

Satan, represented by the figure of a dragon, i. 290; chaining and loosing of, 293; contends with Michael for the body of Moses, ii. 269

Saviour, the epithet applied to Jesus in the second epistle of Peter, but not in the first, ii. 460

Schenkel, on the theosophic mysticism of the Christ-party at Corinth, i. 25; supposes that Ophitism is opposed in the pastoral epistles, ii. 65, 66; on the mental development of Jesus, 302; on the Messianic belief in Jesus' visible return as expressed in Matthew xxiv. xxv., i. 403

Schinz on the existence of parties in the Philippian church, i. 170

Schleiermacher, on the integrity of the second epistle to the Corinthians, i. 58; his view of the *logia* written by Matthew according to Papias, 369; rejects the authenticity of the first epistle to Timothy, ii. 20, 21; attaches small value to Jude's epistle, 274; supposes that Jesus did not really expire on the cross, 294, 295

Schmidt, the first that doubted the authenticity of the second epistle to the Thessalonians, i. 348; on the Cephas and Christ parties in the Corinthian church, 23; followed by Baur, 23

SCH

Schneckenburger, on the sources of Acts, ii. 138; supposes that a Gentile Christian may have used a Jewish calendar in the Acts, 151

Scholten, supposes that the genealogy in Luke is a later addition to the gospel, i. 451; that Polycarp's epistle ignores the first of John, ii. 231; supposes that the author of John xxi. inserted various passages of an objective nature in the gospel, 426, 427

Scholz, on the inscription *ad Spartos* for the first epistle of John, ii. 245

Schott, on Paul's visits to Corinth, i. 38; on the unity of the two Petrine epistles, ii. 462, 463

Schrader, his insertion of an unnoticed visit of Paul's to Corinth in the apostle's abode at Ephesus (Acts xix.), i. 39; on the second epistle to the Corinthians, 50; his late date of the Galatian epistle, 73; takes exception to the greater part of the Philippian epistle, 158

Schulthess, on the Laodicean epistle, ii. 194

Schulz, supposes that Romans xvi. 1–20 was written from Rome to the Ephesians, i. 133, 134; supposes that the church at Colossæ was founded by Paul, ii. 171

Schwanbeck, on the Acts, ii. 144, 145, 152

Schwegler, rejects the authenticity of the Philippian epistle, i. 159; dates the epistle of James in the second century, 312, 313; on the date of Peter's first epistle, 524; on the epistle to the Colossians, ii. 190; on the second epistle of Peter, 468

Scoffers, allusion to, in the second epistle of Peter, ii. 467

Second coming of Christ, Paul preaches the, at Thessalonica, i. 5; the central idea of the Revelation, 282; Paul's view of, 283; view in the second epistle to the Thessalonians, different from Paul's, 339, 340. *See* Advent, second

Seed, Paul's argument based upon the singular number of the noun, untenable, i. 100

SIN

Sejanus, transports 4,000 Jews to Sardinia, i. 101; his fall, 101

Semler, doubted Peter's direct authorship of the first epistle called after him, i. 521

Seneca, his statement respecting the Jews at Rome, i. 106; loss of his influence at the Roman court, 168

Septuagint, the author of the epistle to the Hebrews acquainted with the Old Testament only through this version, i. 217; citations from in the gospel of Matthew, 420, 421; citations from in John's gospel, ii. 436, 437

Seufert, on the similarities between first epistle of Peter and that to the Ephesians, ii. 225

Seven, the leading number in the Revelation, i. 284

Severian, bishop of Gabala, admits the Pauline origin of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 194

Severus of Antioch, favourable to the ending of Mark's gospel at xvi. 9, i. 572

Shepherd of Hermas, allusions to the epistle to the Colossians in, ii. 177; supposed allusions to the second epistle of Peter, 444

Shepherd, the good, narrative of, presents Christ as the light of the world, ii. 284, 285

Silas or Silvanus, with Paul at Thessalonica, i. 350; went with Paul thence to Berœa, 350; supposed to have gone on to Athens, 350; with Paul at Corinth, 6, 18; supposed bearer of the second Corinthian epistle, 57; accompanies Paul to Philippi, 156; reputed author of the epistle to the Hebrews, 180; alleged bearer of the first epistle of Peter, 525, 532

Silvanus. *See* Silas

Simon, name of, changed to Cephas or Peter, i. 501

Simon Magus, followed to Rome by Peter, i. 103, 503, 504; ii. 123

Sin, original, doctrine of, as taught by Paul, i. 140 etc.

Sinker, gives passages in the Testaments of the twelve patriarchs supposed to be taken from the fourth gospel, ii. 358

SIN

Sins, venial and deadly, distinction between, in the first epistle of John, ii. 237, 238

Sinaitic MS., its arrangement of the catholic epistles different from that of other ancient Greek MSS., i. 303

Sixteenth chapter of the epistle to the Romans, supposed to be spurious, i. 122, etc.; the work of a Pauline Christian, 122; opinions of Schulz and others as to the greater part of it, 123, 124

Six hundred and sixty-six, number of the beast, the numerical letters in Cæsar Nero, i. 291; represented by Innocent III. as the duration of Mohammed's power, 300, 301

Slaves, Christian, and their masters, apostolic injunctions respecting, i. 530; ii. 20

Socrates the historian, on the place of Matthew's death, i. 365

Sodom and Gomorrah, narrative of their destruction quoted by Clement of Rome and in the second epistle of Peter, ii. 443

Sophia, the last of the æons in the Gnostic heresy, brought into connection with the Philippian epistle by Baur, i. 159; reference to, in the Colossian epistle, ii. 181, 182

Sosthenes, converted by Paul, i. 18; probably Paul's amanuensis in writing the first epistle to the Corinthians, 19; supposed to be the companion of Titus mentioned in the eighth chapter of 2 Corinthians, 58

Spain, Paul's journey to, critical remarks upon, ii. 21–24

Sparthos (*ad Sparthos*) a title of the first epistle of John, ii. 245

Spirits, evil, peculiar ideas of, entertained by the writer of the Ephesian epistle, ii. 213, 214

Spiritual gifts in the Corinthian church, i. 35, 36

Steitz refers Papias's words, *the truth itself*, to Christ, ii. 332; on the passover controversy, 378, 385; on John xix. 35, 405

Steiger, on the style of 1 Peter, i. 526

Stephanas, his arrival at Ephesus with a letter to Paul from Corinth, i. 19

SYR

Stephen, martyrdom of, ii. 76, 77, 122; influences the mind of Paul, 122, 124; his citations from the Old Testament inaccurate, 113, 114

Strabo, styles Colossæ a little town, ii. 170

Strauss, on the source of the story of the woman taken in adultery, ii. 431; on the Messianic belief of Jesus' visible return, as expressed in Matthew xxiv. xxv., i. 402

Stuart, Moses, his catalogue of Hebraisms in the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 208; on the linguistic character of the epistle, 215; on the language of the Revelation compared with that of the fourth gospel, 260, 261; styles the Revelation an epopee, 280; on the principle of numerosity in the Revelation, 285

Suetonius, on the banishment of the Jews from Rome, i. 102

Supernatural religion, author of, on Justin's supposed quotation from the fourth gospel, ii. 348; suspects the fragments of Apollinaris, bearing on the Paschal controversy, 383

Supper, the Lord's, Luke's account differs from that of the other evangelists, i. 462, 463; agrees with that in 1 Cor. xi.; abused by members of the Corinthian church, 30, 31. *See* Corinthians

Synchronism, principle of, adopted by interpreters of the Revelation, i. 300

Synoptic gospels, their verbal parallels, i. 356–363; compared with John's, ii. 314, 315

Synoptists, take no notice of the Lazarus miracle, ii. 286, 322; their day of the crucifixion irreconcilable with that in the fourth gospel, 369–371; their doctrine of Christ's person nearer to that taught by Justin than to the Logos-doctrine of the fourth gospel, 344

Syria, Paul sails for, from Corinth with Aquila and Priscilla, i. 18

Syriac version, or Peshito, contains the epistles to the Thessalonians, 10, 339; the position of the epistle to the

Hebrews in, favours the Barnabas authorship, 178; contains James's epistle, 326; omits the Revelation, 243; contains the first epistle of Peter, 507; admits the pastoral epistles, ii. 39; contains the first epistle of John, but not the second and third epistles, 232; also the second epistle of Peter, 449

Syrian church, receives the epistle to the Hebrews into its canon, i. 193. *See* Peshito, Syriac version

TACITUS, statement of, respecting the destruction of Laodicea, ii. 151, 191; used by Zumpt in arguing for Quirinius' twofold governorship of Syria, i. 496

Tatian, his harmony recognised the gospel of John, ii. 359; confounded with Ammonius, 360; commented on by Ephrem, 359

Tayler, Mr., supposes that the sixth chapter of John's gospel contains the doctrine of the Lord's supper, ii. 301; uses it as an argument for the gospel's late origin, 301

Teachers, false, warnings against, addressed to Timothy, ii. 18, 19; their doctrines exposed, 19, 37, 64–66; others alluded to in the second epistle of Peter, 466; and in Jude, 270, 271

Teaching of Jesus, nature of, i. 2, 3

Temple worship, supposed allusions to the, in the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 198–201

Tertullian, attests the authenticity of the Thessalonian epistles, i. 10, 338; quotes the Corinthian epistles, 42, 63; attests the authenticity of the Galatian epistle, 86; refers to the epistle to the Romans, 118; to the epistle to Philemon, 152; the epistle to the Philippians, 158; favours the Barnabas authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews, 177; does not mention James's epistle, 324; uses the Revelation as an apostolic production, 243; refers to the first epistle of Peter, 507; attests the Pauline authorship of the epistle to the Colossians, ii. 177; favours the address to Ephesus of the Ephesian epistle, 197, 198; believes that the epistle of Jude was written by an apostle, 266; on the relation between Luke and Paul, 433, 434; his vague testimony to Luke's gospel, i. 448; says that Marcion's gospel wanted Luke iii.–iv. 30, 499; calls Mark's Gospel Peter's, 536; the bearing of the Acts of Pilate on Mark xvi. 9-20, 575; his statement about false teachers appealing to passages in the pastoral epistles, ii. 41; quotes the first epistle of John as apostolic, 232; receives John's gospel as authentic, 369

Testament, Old, quoted often by Matthew, i. 410, 416, 420, 421; quoted in the epistle to the Hebrews, 196–198; citations from in John's gospel, ii. 436, 437; difference of citation in the two epistles of Peter, 461

Testaments of the twelve patriarchs, cited on behalf of John's gospel, ii. 358

Theile supposes that the epistle of James has free quotations from Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, i. 322

Themison, a Montanist, composes an epistle called *catholic*, i. 302

Theodore of Mopsuestia, admits the Pauline authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 193; rejects the epistle of James, 326; rejects the first epistle of Peter, 508; rejects the second and third epistles of John, ii. 257; the epistle of Jude also, 268; rejects Peter's second epistle, 452

Theodoret, his subscription of the Galatian epistle, i. 79; gives the tenth place among the epistles to that to the Hebrews, and so favours its Pauline origin, 191; identifies James son of Alpheus and James the Lord's brother, 304

Theodotus, the Valentinian, appeals to passages in the Ephesian epistle, ii. 207

Theognostus of Alexandria, admits the epistle to the Hebrews as Pauline, i. 191

Theophilus, Luke's gospel addressed to, i. 479–481; the Acts addressed to, ii. 165

Theophilus of Antioch, attests the authenticity of the epistle to the Romans, i. 117; accepts the Revelation as apostolic, 243; receives Luke's gospel, 448; alludes to the pastoral epistles, ii. 38; alludes to the Colossian epistle, 177; does not mention Jude, 268; receives John's gospel as apostolic, 365; refers to Peter's second epistle, 446

Therma, the ancient site of Thessalonica, i. 4; situated at the mouth of the Echedorus, 4; named by Cassander after his wife, 4

Thermaic gulf, the embouchure of the Echedorus, i. 4

Theosophic mysticism, supposed to be the distinguishing feature of the Christ-party in the Corinthian church, i. 25

Thessalonica, city of, on the site of the ancient Therma, at the mouth of the Echedorus, i. 4; named by Cassander, 4; metropolis of Macedonia, 4; seat of a Roman proconsul and quæstor, 4; favourably situated for trade, 4; visited by Paul and Silas, perhaps by Timothy also, 4; the apostle's ministry there, and the apocalyptic tendency of his preaching, 4, 5; nature of the church, 4; duration of his stay at, 4, 5; Jews of, persecute Paul and compel him to retire first to Berœa and then to Athens, 5

Thessalonians, *first epistle*, to the date and place, i. 6; sent by Timothy, 6; occasion and object, 6; its contents, 6–8; evidence of authenticity derived from the fathers, 8–10; Baur's arguments against, adduced and combated, 11–16; difference between Paul in it and in his four larger epistles, 16

Thessalonians, *second epistle* to the, its contents, i. 336, 337; evidence of authenticity derived from the fathers, 337–339; arguments against its complete authenticity, 339–347; partial authenticity, 347; the original retouched and enlarged by a Pauline Christian, 347;

opinions of modern critics, 348; the Thessalonian epistles compared with the Acts, 349, 350; order of, 350, 351. *See* advent, the second; antichrist; eschatology; Thessalonians, first epistle

Thiersch, identifies the Laodicean epistle with that to Philemon, i. 155; his opinion about Gnosticism in the apostolic period, groundless, ii. 269

Tholuck, on the composition of the Roman church, i. 109; argues in favour of the Palestinian origin of the Logos-doctrine in the fourth gospel, ii. 298; his view of Romans vii. 7–25, i. 147

Thoma, tries to show Justin's use of the fourth gospel, ii. 340

Thomson, Archbishop, on Justin's quotations from the fourth gospel, ii. 340; his incorrect assertion about Justin's quotations from Mark, i. 570, note

Thousand years. *See* millennium.

Timothy, a native of Derbe, ii. 1; Paul takes him as his assistant, 1; converted by the apostle, 1; his intimacy with Paul, 1, 2; set apart for the work of the ministry at Lystra, 2; his visits to different places with or without the apostle, 2; with Paul at Rome, 2; perhaps a prisoner there, 2; mentioned in the epistles written at Rome, 2; bishop of the church at Ephesus, 2; said to have suffered martyrdom, 2

Timothy, second epistle to, time and place of writing, ii. 2, 3; its contents, 4–6; agreement of contents with the writer's purpose, 6, 7; authenticity, 8

Timothy, first epistle to, time of writing, ii. 14, 15; its object, 15, 16; its contents, 16–20; authenticity, 20, 21

Titus, a native of Antioch, ii. 8; his visits to various places, 8; introduces the gospel into Crete, 9; *see* Titus, epistle to; his circumcision resisted by Paul, 8; sent by the apostle to the Corinthians, i. 49, 50; with or without a letter, 50, 51; with a letter, according to Bleek; this opinion adopted by

TIT

Credner, Neander, Hilgenfeld, and others, 51; bearer of the second epistle to the Corinthians, 57; supposed bearer of the Galatian epistle, 79

Titus, epistle to, notices of Titus in the New Testament, ii. 8; the gospel introduced into Crete, 9; time and place of writing the epistle, 9; its contents, 10, 11; its object, 12; adaptation of contents to the object, 12, 13; its authenticity, 13

Tiberius, favours the Jews, i. 101

Tigellinus, succeeds Burrus as prefect, i. 168

Tischendorf, von, arrangement of the catholic epistles in his eighth edition of the Greek Testament, i. 303; receives into the text the last clause of 1 John ii. 23, ii. 248; adduces the Barnabas epistle to show the early existence of the fourth gospel, 326; his argument from the Acts of Pilate for the early origin of the fourth gospel, 362, 363; his assertion about the time when the four gospels were translated into Latin and Syriac, incorrect, 388; expunges John vii. 53–viii. 11 from the text, 429

Tongues, gift of, at Pentecost, account of the transaction in the Acts different from Paul's, ii. 101

Trajan, orders the execution of Ignatius at Antioch, i. 9, ii. 328

Transfiguration, mount of, called 'the Holy mount,' its bearing on the authorship of Peter's second epistle, ii. 456

Transcendence, the basis of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 208

Translator of Schleiermacher on Luke (Bishop Thirlwall), on the time of the arrival of the Magi, i. 450, 451

Treviri, speak the same language as the Galatians in after times, i. 71

Tribunals, heathen, appeals to by the church at Corinth, their impropriety, i. 31

Trinity, passage relating to, in 1 John v. 7, 8, spurious, ii. 247; Porson's treatise on, 247; persistence of Burgess and Forster in defence of it, 247, 248

VAL

Trip, admits inexactness in the account of Paul given in Acts ix. 27–28, ii. 91, 92

Troas, visited by Paul, i. 52; the second epistle to the Corinthians supposed to be written from, 56; supposed birthplace of Luke, 425; visited by Titus, ii. 8

Trophimus, supposed to be one of the bearers of the second epistle to the Corinthians, i. 57; accompanies Paul on his way to Greece, 157

Trypho, Justin's dialogue with, passages quoted from, ii. 335–340

Two witnesses, the, in the Revelation, Moses and Elias, i. 280

Tübingen school, view of the pastoral epistles as supposititious, ii. 72

Tychichus, bearer of the Colossian epistle, ii. 193; bearer of the Ephesian letter, 229; accompanies Paul on his way to Greece, i. 157

Tyrannus, school of, Paul's preaching in the, ii. 195

ULLMANN, on the integrity of Peter's second epistle, ii. 469

Uncleanness, sins of, committed in the Corinthian church, i. 29, 53

Ussher, Archbishop, his opinion of the epistle to the Ephesians, ii. 202, 203

Usteri, on the meaning of Gal. iv. 13, i. 73; surrenders the authenticity of the first epistle to Timothy, ii. 73

Uhlhorn, defends the authenticity of the Ignatian epistles, i. 9

VALENTINUS, doubtful whether he employed Luke's gospel, i. 447; unacquainted with John's gospel, ii. 351; Hippolytus' statements respecting, examined, 351, 352; Tertullian's assertion about, 352; his æons not derived from the fourth gospel, 352

Valentinians, used the epistle to the Galatians, i. 86; used the epistle to the Ephesians, ii. 207; and the fourth gospel, 351, 352

VEN

Venus, worship of, at Corinth, i. 17
Vespasian, emperor, supposed to be the checking power of the antichrist or Nero of the second epistle to the Thessalonians, i. 341
Vettius Epagathus, mentioned in the letter of the churches of Vienne and Lyons, words from the fourth gospel applied to him, ii. 361
Vial, the fourth, its supposed reference to the wars of the French Revolution, i. 299
Victor of Antioch, his testimony is against Mark xvi. 9–20, i. 572
Victorinus of Pannonia, rejects the Pauline origin of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 183
Vienne, epistle of the church at, quotes the epistle to the Romans, i. 117; alludes to the Philippian epistle, 158; admits the Revelation, 243; uses the first of Peter, but does not mention the author, 507; refers to the Acts, ii. 148; quotes John's gospel, 361
Vigilius Tapsensis, mentions the title *ad Parthos* of the first epistle of John, ii. 244
Vincent of Lerins, does not quote the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 184
Virgin, the blessed, vision of, to Loyola, ii. 125
Virgins, directions concerning, ii. 19
Volkmar, his date of Clement's epistle to the Corinthians, i. 416; on Marcion's gospel, 476; rejects the Pauline authorship of the Philippian epistle, 159; his opinion of the innumerable multitude in Revelation vii., 254; supposes that the Revelation was written by a disciple of John, 274; rejects the authenticity of the Thessalonian epistles, 348; and the authenticity of 1 Peter, 521
Vulso, C. Manlius, subjugates Galatia, i. 70

WASHING the disciples' feet, narrative of, and its lesson, ii. 288
Weiss, B. supposes that 1 Peter was addressed to Jewish Christians, i. 524; terms Peter the apostle of *hope*, 517

WIE

Weitzel, on the paschal controversy, ii. 385
Weizsäcker, on the Messianic belief of Jesus's visible return as expressed in Matthew xxiv., xxv., i. 402
Westcott, Dr., supposes that Hermas's shepherd was known to the author of the fourth gospel, ii. 327
Western church, does not admit the epistle to the Hebrews as Pauline till the fourth century, i. 194
Wette, de, on the apocalyptic tendency of Paul's preaching at Thessalonica, i. 5; adopts Schenkel's view of the Christ-party at Corinth, 25; suggests difficulties against an unnoticed visit of Paul to Corinth, 38; disallows the reference of 2 Cor. i. 4–10 to Acts xix. 23, etc. in their bearing on the epistle's date, 57; proposes Trophimus as the bearer of the second epistle to the Corinthians, 57; his view of the apostle's design in the epistle to the Romans, 112; his axiomatic principle that the writers of the Revelation and the fourth gospel are different, 275; his interpretation of the twelve tribes scattered abroad, in the epistle of James, 312; on the number of the Philippian epistles, 165; his parallels between Clement's epistle to the Corinthians and the epistle to the Hebrews, 181; his table of parallels between the Colossian and Ephesian epistles, ii. 208; maintains that the contents disagree with the professed object of the first epistle to Timothy, 15; rejects the authenticity of the pastoral epistles, 72; feels insuperable difficulties in the interpretation of John vii. 53–viii. 11, 429
Wetstein, supposes that the persons addressed in the letter to the Hebrews were Roman believers, i. 230
Whiston, translates the apocryphal Corinthian epistles, i. 40; defends their authenticity, 40
Widows, their selection for the office of female elders, ii. 19–52
Wieseler, identifies the Laodicean

WIE

epistle with that to Philemon, i. 155–185; thinks that James the less, not James the Lord's brother, was head of the Jerusalem church, 308; attempts to reconcile the genealogies in Matthew and Luke, 452; puts Paul's journey to Macedonia within his three years' stay at Ephesus, ii. 28; on the chronology of the Acts, 167

Wiesinger, on the Jewish Christians out of Palestine answering those addressed in the epistle of James, i. 311

Wiggers, argues that the church at Colossæ was founded by Paul, ii. 171, 174

Wilkins, translates the apocryphal Corinthian epistles into Armenian, i. 40

Winer, on the solecisms of the Revelation, i. 320

Wisdom of God, an apocryphal writing supposed to be quoted in Luke xi. 49, ii. 318

Wittichen, holds that Luke was unacquainted with the genealogy in Matthew, i. 428; supposes that the genealogy in Luke is a later addition to the gospel, 451; admits subjectivity in the speeches of the Johannine Christ, ii. 314

Wives, duties of, i. 530

Worship, public, Paul's directions to Timothy respecting, ii. 17

Works and faith, James's doctrine of, in contrast with Paul's, i. 318–320; an argument for the date of the epistle after James, 320–321; opinions of Neander, Bull, O'Brien, and others on, 319, 320

Woman, in the Revelation, supposed to represent the covenant of redemption, i. 300

Woman taken in adultery, narrative of, as a part of the fourth gospel, ii. 427–431

ZWI

Word of God, the Messiah, so-called, i. 263

Word or *Logos*, the doctrine as stated in the fourth gospel, ii. 277, 278

Wolf, assumes the same authorship for the fourth gospel and John's first epistle, ii. 233

XENOPHON, calls Colossæ prosperous and large, ii. 170

ZAHN, on the tradition about John being asked to write a gospel, ii. 367; his work on Tatian's Harmony, 360; holds the Barnabas-authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews, i. 177; attempts to prove the authenticity of the Ignatian epistles, i. 9; supposes that the epistle to the Hebrews was addressed to Jewish believers at Rome, 230; his date of the epistle to Diognetus, 362

Zechariah, book of, furnishes symbols for the Revelation, i. 285, 286

Zeller, Prof., on the Silas-hypothesis of the *we*-document in Acts, ii. 152; refutes the opinion that Luke's gospel was written at Ephesus, i. 479; his view of the designation, the *beginning of the creation of God*, 262; rejects the authenticity of 1 Peter, i. 521

Zoroastrian religion, source of the seven spirits before the throne of God, i. 267

Züllig, assigns the cardinal number seven to the book of Revelation, i. 285

Zumpt, vindicates the accuracy of Luke respecting Quirinius' census, i. 495, 496

Zwingli, rejects the canonicity of the Revelation, i. 275

LONDON: PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

00067920

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 05 October, 2018